

THE
CHRISTIAN SPECTATOR.

No. 4.]

APRIL 1, 1823.

[Vol. V.]

Religious Communications.

For the Christian Spectator.

The doctrine of Providence vindicated.

The doctrine of providence may be considered as in some sense belonging to natural religion. As it results immediately from the perfections of God, it is not strange that the views which men have entertained of it have been almost endlessly modified, according to their various notions of the divine character. Some by denying it altogether, have sunk into the black gulf of atheism; while others have perverted it to excuse the indulgence of sinful appetites, or to sanction the neglect of their soul's salvation, or to tarnish the glory of the everliving Jehovah. But just and rational views of this subject are essentially interwoven with the hopes and consolations of the christian.

It is the design of this article to state a few plain arguments to establish the fact that there is a providence, and then to inquire briefly concerning its *extent*.

I will first endeavor to establish the doctrine of providence; or to show that God exercises a superintendence and care over the works of his hands.

1. My first argument in proof of this doctrine is drawn from creation, and is briefly this: If God created all things, the same reason that induced him to create, must also induce him to preserve and govern them. It is not less a dictate of enlightened reason than scripture, that the ultimate end of the divine being in all

his works, is the promotion of his own glory or the manifestation of his own perfections. Accordingly we find that the pious psalmist, in some of his devout meditations, acknowledges this truth in some of the finest language of poetry and eloquence: 'The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament sheweth forth his handy work. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night sheweth forth knowledge.' But if it were the design of God in creation to present an illustrious exhibition of his perfections, must not the same end be answered in at least an equal degree, by preserving and directing the works of his hands. If it were for the glory of God that his intelligent creatures, on the morning of creation should look forth upon his works, and contemplate the all-creating energy which had been exerted with an admiring and grateful homage, can we suppose that his glory would not be equally promoted by the same spirit of devout admiration being kept *forever* active by his providential care and goodness? To suppose that God created all things, and then resigned his work to the caprice of accident, is to suppose that he abandoned the great end which creation was designed to accomplish: it is to impute to him the weakness of forming a purpose, and from some deficiency either of power or wisdom, of leaving it unaccomplished.

Suppose some ingenious artificer should construct a machine at great expense, which should discover the

most curious and exquisite workmanship, and should be fitted for purposes of great practical utility; and then should abandon it as unworthy of his regard: or suppose some one should build a most magnificent dwelling, and set it off with all the conveniences and decorations of a palace, and the moment it was finished should desert it and leave it to the occupancy of strangers, or let its lofty columns and splendid ornaments decay and moulder, and finally should suffer it to tumble into a mighty mass of ruins: in each of these cases does not the conduct appear worthy only of a maniac? Can you reconcile all this skill, and care, and expense, in constructing the instrument or building, with all this indifference and neglect after the work is actually accomplished, on any other ground than that the person concerned has become a victim to delirium? Let no one then, charge the same infatuated conduct upon the majesty of heaven. Let no one be so weak or so impious as to imagine that the Creator of all things has built the stupendous fabric of the universe, and fitted it up in all the grandeur and beauty which we behold, and filled it with animation and intelligence; and then committed it all to the protection and control of chance, and set down in indolent majesty to see the works of his hand made the sport of accident, and to witness a wild scene of misrule and desolation.

2. Another argument in favor of the doctrine of providence, and closely connected with the preceding, is drawn from the divine perfections.

I am aware that every argument and every conclusion from the perfections of the Deity ought to be conducted with the most reverent caution and the most profound humility. The premises on which we build our conclusions are in one sense entirely beyond our reach, that is, they involve a subject which however clear in some of its general bearings, has after all a depth which the highest finite intelligence can never fathom.

Still there are some general conclusions which may be legitimately drawn from what we know of the character of God; and no one is more obvious than that which respects his providence. Though we cannot previously decide from our knowledge of his perfections, what will be the character of his dispensations in all cases, we may decide with unerring certainty that every thing is under his superintendence and control.

For let it be remembered that his infinite wisdom enables him to look intuitively through all his works, to discern all their various relations and tendencies, and with perfect ease to devise all the means which are necessary for sustaining and directing the empire of providence. His infinite power enables him to execute all his purposes without the possibility of defeat; his omnipotent arm can at the same instant, direct the concerns of heaven, earth and hell; diffusing light and glory in one world, and scattering terror and death in another. His infinite goodness forbids that he should not care for his creatures, and secures to them, unless it be forfeited by sin, the exertion of his wisdom and power in their favour. Surely then, it is no rash conclusion which we make from the perfections of God, when we say that he must necessarily exercise a providence; for his providence is only his character, if I may be allowed the expression, embodied in action. Were he to cease to govern the world, then he must cease to be what he is, and of course must cease to be God; for though he does not act from a blind or physical necessity, the perfection of his nature makes it absolutely certain that he will act agreeably to the eternal rule of righteousness; and this rule he must forever abandon, if he were to abandon the control of his own works.

3. The doctrine of providence may be proved from the actual state of things with which we are conversant. Whence all this order, and beauty, and majesty which we behold

in the material world? If there be no invisible, sustaining and directing hand, how is it that the planets continue to roll from year to year, and from age to age with the same magnificent harmony? How will you account for the regularity of the seasons, for the uniform changes of day and night, for the regular progress of vegetation, and for all the kind provision which is made for your sustenance and enjoyment? What is it that causes the beating pulse, that tempers the atmosphere to the preservation of life, that sends the vital fluid through the system, that keeps this 'harp of thousand strings' in tune so long? If it required almighty power and infinite wisdom to create these works, nothing short of the same power and wisdom must be necessary to sustain and direct them; and if we abandon the doctrine of providence, the very existence, much more the regularity of every thing around us, presents a phenomenon of which no rational solution can be given.

I know it has sometimes been said that the Creator after he had finished his works, communicated to them a certain impulse, or established certain laws, by which they were to regulate themselves, so that he might safely withdraw his superintendence. But if by the 'laws of nature' be meant any thing more than those rules which infinite wisdom has been pleased to prescribe to itself in the government of the world, who does not perceive that the language partakes either of fatalism or atheism? But in what light, let me ask, does this theory of divine providence, if it can be called such, place the character of God? Does it not exhibit him as an indolent spectator of his own work, and as manifesting a degree of indifference to the affairs of the universe, altogether irreconcilable with infinite perfection.

4. The doctrine of providence is equally clear from the preservation of the church. Every one who has any knowledge even of the great out-

lines of the history of the church, must know that its preservation is a standing miracle. Its march from the beginning has been through a wilderness; and not unfrequently through scenes of blood and desolation, which nothing but the miraculous interposition of heaven, could have enabled it to survive. Who does not remember the afflicted state of the children of Israel while they were in Egypt?—how they were rescued from the hand of their oppressors by a series of the most stupendous and appalling miracles, how they were left to wander in the wilderness, and were guided by a pillar of cloud and of fire, and how the waters retired to open a passage for them into the promised land? Who has not read how the hand of God was with them to enable them to put their enemies to flight, and how amidst all the variety of afflictions to which they were subject, the fire was never suffered to consume them, nor the floods to overflow them? When the gospel was introduced by the advent of the Saviour, there seemed to be a league formed between earth and hell to exterminate the church; and yet in spite of all their efforts, she rose and triumphed, and planted her banner even in the very heart of Satan's empire. And from that time to the present, who does not know that a large part of the history of the church has been written in tears and blood;—that the floods of persecution have rolled over her, and the flames of martyrdom have blazed around her, and a darkness that could be felt has settled upon her; and yet that she has gradually been extending herself from continent to continent, and gathering laurels even from the blood of her own martyrs. Is not this an argument in favour of our doctrine that is irresistible? If the doctrine of providence be not true, tell us why the church was not sacrificed to the fiendlike violence of Pharaoh, or why she was not destroyed by her innumerable enemies in Canaan, or why she has

never been a victim to any of the ten thousand plots that have been laid to crush her? If God does not exercise a providence, we challenge a solution of the fact that the church still exists, and is every day going forward in the march of her triumphs;—nay, that the religion of Jesus Christ existed for an hour after its author was laid in the tomb. Whether therefore, we consider the history of the church as a whole, or only fix upon particular dispensations, the evidence in favour of our doctrine cannot fail with every honest mind, to be conclusive.

5. The last argument which I shall adduce for the doctrine of providence, is drawn from the fulfilment of prophecy. That none can foretell future events but God only, or some one whom he has miraculously counselled, is a truth too obvious to demand proof. If then there be instances in which future events actually have been foretold, and that too in circumstances the most unexceptionable, we have complete evidence of the direct agency of God in the government of the world. Now you have only to open the bible and compare the predictions which you find in one part with the history which you find in another, or to compare the same predictions with the historical record of profane writers, or even with facts which have fallen under your own observation, to be completely satisfied that numerous and important events have fallen out exactly according to prophecies delivered long before their occurrence. It is hardly necessary to say that the prophecies respecting the character, life and death of our Saviour, the destruction of the Jewish polity, the dispersion and preservation of the Jews as a distinct people, and the reign of popery in the christian church, have had a literal and exact accomplishment. It will easily be perceived that every instance of the fulfilment of prophecy presents an argument in favor of the doctrine of providence, which no sophistry can evade; and indeed it appears to be the very high-

est kind of evidence of which the subject is susceptible.

I might protract this discussion by referring to several other sources of evidence, as well as enlarging upon those which I have already noticed. But it is not necessary: for the general view of the doctrine which has now been taken, must so readily commend itself to every unprejudiced mind, that the reason of my discussing it at all, has been rather to strengthen in my readers a conviction of its importance, than from any apprehension that it was necessary to convince gainsayers, at least among those into whose hands this article may be likely to fall.

I will now briefly inquire concerning the *extent* of that providence which God exercises over his creatures.

I remark in general that the providence of God is universal and particular. It extends to all beings that have existed, or ever will exist;—to all events that have occurred or ever will occur. Our Saviour teaches this doctrine most explicitly when he tells his disciples that the very hairs of their head are numbered, and that not a sparrow falls to the ground without their Father. If the providence of God extends to the numbering of hairs and the falling of sparrows, surely there is no object, no event so insignificant, as to escape his observation and direction.

It is obvious that all the arguments which have been adduced to prove that God exercises a providence at all, go equally to establish the truth that this providence is in the highest degree particular: for if it is consistent with the divine perfections that one event may take place without the direction or superintendence of God, it may, for aught that appears, be equally consistent that other events should happen in the same way; and so that the whole course of events should be left to the caprice of accident. Indeed the very fact that God exercises a *general*

superintendence over his works, implies that that superintendence is *particular*; because the great system of things over which in the former case, he is supposed to have a general control, is made up of a series of distinct and particular events to which nothing but a particular providence could apply.

But the illustration of this subject which is perhaps most satisfactory to the heart of the christian, may be gained by a reference to particular events, that occur in the life of almost every man. Who of us has not witnessed the defeat of some favorite plan which seemed likely to result greatly to our advantage, and yet has afterwards reaped from this disappointment an unexpected harvest of joy? Has not the poor and afflicted christian sometimes experienced interpositions almost as signal as if the clouds had rained down food, or the rock had sent forth water? And does not the man of the world and even the thoughtless sinner who casts off fear and restrains prayer, sometimes experience events so manifestly marked by the hand of God, as to extort even from *him* a momentary acknowledgment of a particular providence? I know that the impious scoffer will tell us that all this is the result of accident; and he will misname the signal interpositions of heaven by the epithets of 'good fortune' and 'good luck;' but the humble christian will discern in them all, the hand of a wise and holy God. To the devoted follower of Jesus, or to the man of only an ordinary degree of serious reflection, there is perhaps nothing which proves more satisfactorily a particular providence, than a recollection of the peculiar dealings of God towards himself; no other argument comes home like this to his own bosom: he feels that he is led by an invisible hand; and if that hand had not been extended for his protection and deliverance, that his feet would long ere this have stumbled upon the dark mountains of death.

Does any one ask whether the providence of God extends even to the moral actions of men;—whether it recognizes them in the high character of accountable beings? I answer, yes, undoubtedly: because in instances almost innumerable, events have been foretold which depended on a long train of moral actions. Moreover the conduct of men as moral agents is connected with the most important results: on a single moral action may be suspended the destiny of a state or an empire. Is it reasonable to suppose then, that God should have excluded from his providence, those actions which exert the greatest influence in his kingdom, and yet that he should be attentive to so minute a concern as the falling of a sparrow? If we deny that his providence extends in any manner to our moral conduct, we virtually deny the doctrine of providence altogether; for by far the greatest number of important events are, in this way, thrown at once upon the direction of chance.

Does any one press the inquiry in what precise manner the providence of God reaches our moral actions; or how a divine influence upon the human mind can be exerted in consistency with our moral nature? I answer, I cannot tell. But one thing is plain and deserves to be attentively noticed; and that is, that whatever may be the nature of the divine influence upon the mind, it is nothing but what is consistent with all the powers of moral agency. That we possess freedom of action is a truth which is taken for granted in all the invitations, and promises, and threatenings of religion; a truth, the very highest evidence of which we carry about with us in our own consciousness, and that God has some access to the human mind, and influences us not only as intellectual but moral beings, no one can legitimately deny, without finding himself amidst the chilling horrors of atheism. These two points of moral agency and divine influence being thus established by the highest

evidence of which the subject is susceptible, it becomes us to receive them without indulging our irreverent cavils concerning any apparent disagreement, which may arise from our ignorance. And if any one will still deny the reality of a divine influence because he does not know the manner in which it operates, I would say that he may with just as much consistency, deny the principle of gravitation in philosophy, only because he cannot explain the phenomena with which it is connected. When you will have thoroughly analyzed the principle by which the planets roll in their orbits, or by which a stone thrown into the air falls to the ground, I may safely promise to gratify the extent of your curiosity in respect to the manner in which the providence of God is concerned in the direction of our moral conduct.

I am aware that an objection has sometimes been urged against the doctrine under consideration from the present sufferings of the righteous and the triumphs of the wicked: and at first view, it certainly does seem mysterious how it can consist with the moral character of God that virtue should be left to suffer and vice to triumph. But the whole difficulty vanishes at once when we recollect that both the subjects of virtue and of vice are immortal; and the providence of God is not confined with respect to either of them to the present life but extends to eternity. Now then, even if revelation had withheld her light from this subject, would it not be perfectly natural to conclude that in a future life all these apparent inequalities will be rectified by the measuring out of an exact retribution. May it not be perfectly consistent with justice that the wicked should exult for a while in their wickedness in order to prepare themselves for a more aggravated condemnation; and on the other hand that the good and virtuous should have a larger share of suffering allotted to them in the present life that by the profitable improvement of this discipline, they may be prepared for higher mansions

in glory. If the doctrine of a future life, be once admitted, the unequal retributions of the present life would not be at all inconsistent with the general doctrine of providence, even if we were without revelation: but the Bible has revealed to us the whole secret, and assured us explicitly that what we know not now, we shall know hereafter.

The preceding train of reflection, shows us how very far removed is the scripture doctrine of providence from fatalism. The former, though it knows no such thing as chance or accident in the sense in which these words are frequently used, and though it recognizes either a direct or permissive divine agency in every human action and volition, yet it knows no influence which is inconsistent with the highest moral agency of man. It recognizes him as capable of doing good or evil, as possessing every faculty necessary to the highest moral freedom, and on this broad ground is built the doctrine of man's accountability. The scheme of fatalism, on the other hand, excludes all moral agency, and supposes that every event that takes place is subject to an uncontrollable necessity. But if this is the height of absurdity, and if we are really free, as the scripture doctrine of providence supposes, let us remember that the power of moral action invests our condition with a high degree of solemnity. If you claim for yourself the freedom of a moral agent, then I would say, act in consistency with your own claims, and do not pervert that freedom to the purpose of destruction. You are indeed in the highest sense a moral agent; and the fact that you are so, leaves you without excuse for refusing the claims of religion a single hour. Not till you welcome the Saviour to your heart, and yield yourself to the precepts of the gospel, do you act worthy of the character of a moral and accountable being.

How interesting a view do these reflections present of the character of God. How sublime and yet how de-

lightful is the thought that it is the same Being who rolls the planets, and changes the seasons, and controls the destinies of empires; and who on the other hand, notices and directs even the falling of a sparrow. His eye is at all times, in all places: nothing can elude his observation; nothing can withstand his power. The greatest and the meanest of human concerns are alike under his control. Let us learn from this view of the divine character always to approach him with sentiments of reverence. Let us learn too in what consists the highest dignity of human nature. It is not in endeavouring to conceal our littleness by assuming the mock majesty of the world, but in imitating the diffusive benevolence of our heavenly Father, whose providential care extends to all his creatures. Let us learn too a lesson of humility; for if we have been constantly upheld and blessed by a kind and gracious providence, where has been our gratitude proportioned to the extent and variety of our mercies? Let us endeavor to retrieve our character by practising the humility, the benevolence, the gratitude, which become us as creatures of God.

Finally: the christian will anticipate me when I say that this doctrine is full of consolation to him. The best epitome of the doctrine of providence, as it respects the christian, is given by the apostle when he says that 'all things shall work together for good to them that love God:' and is there a promise, can there be a promise more rich and consolatory? In the deepest floods of adversity can you not be satisfied with the assurance that every successive chastisement is administered by a father's hand, and is designed to elevate you to a higher seat in glory? Are you poor, or sick, or afflicted? Have your friends deserted you in the day of trouble, and are you left to bear the whole burden of your sorrow without the kindly alleviation of human sympathy? Only bring home to your hearts, in the energy of practical ap-

plication, the doctrine of providence, and the tears of sorrow will be changed into tears of gratitude. Trust in the Lord with all the heart, and though weeping may endure for a night, joy will come in the morning.

RELIGIOSUS.

For the Christian Spectator.

The fearful Exhibition on Mount Sinai corresponded with the Nature of the Law there delivered,—A SERMON from Heb. xii 21.

And so terrible was the sight, that Moses said, I exceedingly fear and quake.

THE object of the apostle in the verses with which these words are connected, is to show the superiority of the dispensation under the gospel, to that under the law. For this purpose, he draws a contrast between the terrors of Mount Sinai, and the winning aspect of Mount Sion. The latter is immaterial, spiritual, and clothed with none of the frightful appearances which awed the people at the foot of the former.

It is not wonderful that Moses was agitated, when called to ascend alone to the summit of Sinai, and there meet the eternal God; for since the world was made, there probably never was a scene more calculated both from its physical and its moral grandeur, to overwhelm a spectator with awe and terror. By the divine command, Moses set bounds all around the mount to keep the people from too near an approach, saying, 'Take heed to yourselves, that ye go not up into the mount, or touch the border of it: whosoever toucheth the mount shall be surely put to death: There shall not an hand touch it, but he shall surely be stoned, or shot through; whether it be beast or man, it shall not live. And it came to pass on the third day in the morning, that there were thunders and lightnings, and a thick cloud upon the mount, and the voice of the trumpet exceeding loud; so that all the

people that was in the camp trembled. And mount Sinai was altogether on a smoke, because the Lord descended upon it in fire; and the smoke thereof ascended as the smoke of a furnace, and the whole mount quaked greatly. And when the voice of the trumpet sounded long, and waxed louder and louder, Moses spake, and God answered him by a voice.' What Moses spake at this time, is supposed to have been the language which the apostle ascribes to him in the text: 'I exceedingly fear and quake.' And amid all these awful sights and sounds, these lightnings and thunders, this fire and blackness, this darkness and tempest, the sound of the trumpet, and the voice of the Almighty,—who would not have been afraid? The darkness that enveloped the mount must have rendered the lightning more vivid, the thunder more shocking, the tempest more dreadful, and the whole scene more appalling, to Moses and the people.

Do you ask why the giving of the law was attended by an exhibition so inexpressibly solemn and terrifying? It was that the justice of God, his righteous demands, his hatred of sin, his authority, and his power to punish, might be clearly displayed; and thus the people be filled with solemnity, and awed into obedience. But there is another more general consideration which I wish to impress upon your minds at this time; viz. *The striking correspondence of that tremendous scene, with the nature of the law then delivered.*

1. It accorded with the *extent* of the divine requisitions. The Ten Commandments comprise, expressly or implicitly, all the duties which God exacts of 'every man according to his several ability.' They allow us to commit no sin, and demand uninterrupted obedience from the instant that we become moral agents, till the moment that closes our term of probation. The law lays the whole weight of its obligations on all our intellectual faculties, on all our mor-

al energies, and on all our bodily powers. We have no capacity, natural or moral, bodily or mental, which it does not, directly or indirectly, lay under unceasing contribution to the service of God. It leaves us not a moment of time to be devoted to vain, selfish or sinful pursuits; and it permits us to think our own thoughts, speak our own words, and perform our own acts, no further than they proceed from a holy love to God and man. So extensive and strict is the divine law, that it requires us to think, feel, speak, act and live for God and his glory, without intermission till death. How strikingly accordant then, with the nature of this law, was the affecting scene that attended the promulgation of it on the mount! Every peal of thunder, and every blast of the trumpet, was but another demonstration to the senses of the Hebrews, that the claims of God upon them were co-extensive with their utmost faculties of obedience; and that he not only had a right to all their services, but intended to maintain and enforce that right.

2. The exhibition on Sinai accorded with the *spirituality* of the law. Before the Lord descended upon the mount, the Israelites were required to spend two whole days in sanctifying themselves by an exact and cordial observance of certain rites which were prescribed for the occasion. Lest they should have been deficient in the service, Moses, after God had descended and when the mount was altogether on a smoke, was required to go down and command them again to 'sanctify themselves, lest the Lord break forth upon them.' They were then to receive the law, and enter into covenant with God. Of course, the sanctification enjoined, was something more than a washing of their clothes; something more than a solemn countenance and a reformed exterior. It was a holy temper—a regenerate heart. The awful scene was directly calculated to impress upon them the necessity of *internal* sanctification.

And what proud formalist is there in these times, who, waked at midnight by a terrible storm of thunder, does not feel that he infinitely needs something better than mere outward moralities, to fit him to appear before a God who has all the elements at his command. During a tornado, when forests are upturned, beasts running and roaring with dread, buildings demolished, and all nature seeming to give way amid the spreading desolation; how deeply do most persons not hardened in sin, feel that the law which they have broken requires inward purity, and that without a holy heart they are totally unfit to fall into the hands of Him who has waked the storm. When the sky is serene; when all things around are tranquil and import no danger, men may regard the law of God as a body of statutes which have relation only to external observances. But when, during the ravages of a tempest, or the convulsions of an earthquake, the Almighty sets the elements in commotion, and brings death near into view, people generally are filled with horror, and made to feel almost instinctively that the law is spiritual, that it relates primarily to the inmost soul, and that it must be death eternal to stand before God in judgment with unsanctified affections. You may judge then, how well the dreadful exhibition on Sinai was suited to inspire the trembling spectators with a sense of the spirituality of the law. But what the law then was, it is now; and to understand its true character, it behooves us often to contemplate a scene, which made even holy Moses 'exceedingly fear and quake.'

3. The fearful scene on the mount accorded with the *obscurity* of the law. The apostle speaks, in the context, of the 'blackness and darkness' that made so conspicuous a part of the appalling exhibition. This part of the appearance, bore a strong analogy to the ceremonial law, which imposed so great a diversity of outward observances. All these rites

and ceremonies pointed, indeed, to something which was future; but to what precisely, the ritual did not state. They were but 'shadows of good things to come.' Now it belongs to the very nature of a shadow, to be less visible and distinct than the object which it represents; and of a type, to be less definite and intelligible than the object which it typifies. Hence the numerous rites of that dispensation, if not explained by something more explicit than the law itself, must have been very imperfectly understood during the long period of fifteen hundred years. It cannot be denied that the Hebrews were under a dark dispensation; for while, on one hand, the moral law gave them no information concerning the glories of the New-Testament economy, on the other, the knowledge which the ceremonial law afforded them relative to that future day, was imparted through the obscure medium of types and shadows. Surely, therefore, the 'blackness and darkness' which made such an important part of the tremendous spectacle on Sinai, was analogous to the obscurity of the law under which they were then placed. Dreadful was the darkness which brooded over the mount; and dreadful was the darksome situation of the Israelites under the law, in comparison with our situation under the luminous dispensation of the gospel, which has done away every legal shadow, by a clear exhibition of the substance.

4. The memorable scene on the mount corresponded with the *burdensomeness* of the law. We have only to peruse the complicated ritual, to perceive how difficult it must have been for the people, to find sufficient time for the performance of all the ceremonies which were commanded. It is wonderful how any one of them could pass through a single day without contracting, I do not say intentionally, but inadvertantly, some ceremonial uncleanness. There was a distinction between clean and unclean beasts, birds, fishes and oth-

er articles of food; and with all their care, how could they but defile themselves at times by mistaking the unclean for the clean? There were many things which they could not even *touch*, without polluting themselves in the eye of the law. Some of these they must have touched unconsciously; and others almost necessarily; for instance, the dead bodies which they wrapped in the habiliments of death, and committed to the grave. Under certain circumstances often difficult to be ascertained, ceremonial defilement attached to their vessels of wood, their earthen vessels, their ovens, their raiment, and the water of their fountains. Indeed, the ritual contemplates cases in which persons would contract pollution unawares; and yet regards them as none the less unclean on that account. 'If a soul touch any unclean thing'—and things of this kind were almost innumerable—'and if it be *hidden from him*, he also shall be unclean and guilty.' If we look at the laborious formalities involved in a trial for the leprosy, or incontinence; at the number of feasts, and their minute observances peculiar to each; at the great diversity of offerings, in connection with the exactness of times, and the long detail of ceremonies, that belonged to each of those offerings; at the numerous rules by which the priests were to regulate their dress, slay the victims, sprinkle the blood, and dispose of the various parts of those victims; and at all the other portions of the complicated system of rites, with which no priest, probably, since the days of Aaron, was so familiar as to commit no practical mistake,—we cannot resist the belief that the dispensation under the Sinai covenant was indescribably burdensome. This appears, however, not only from an examination of the law, but also from many declarations of the New Testament. In the days of the apostles, the Pharisees thought 'it was needful to circumcise the Gentile converts, 'and to command them to keep the law

of Moses.' But Peter said, 'Now therefore why tempt ye God to put a *yoke* upon the neck of the disciples which neither our fathers nor we were *able to bear*?' But the yoke of circumcision, however insupportable, was far less burdensome than the yoke imposed by the Levitical law. Paul illustrates the subject by an allusion to the case of children who are 'under tutors and governors until the time appointed of the father;' in other words, till they are of age and free. 'Even so we, when we were children,'—that is, when we were under the discipline of the ceremonial law, 'were in *bondage*.' And when some in his day seemed to cast off their christian profession, and to be verging back towards their former ritual performances for justification, he expostulated with them in this forcible manner: 'How turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in *bondage*? Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain.'

Considering therefore, the numberless and toilsome exactnesses which were required of the Israelites, under the Sinai dispensation, how strikingly did the scene that transpired on the mount, harmonize with the nature of the law of 'meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation,' in the days of the Messiah's reign. What could have so perfectly accorded with the character of that rigorously formal institute, which it is said in the context, 'they could not endure' as the 'blackness and darkness, and tempest, and the sound of a trumpet, and the voice of words,' which were seen and heard on that alarming occasion?

5. The terrors of that day corresponded with the *silence* of the law respecting the possibility and the real ground of pardon. If we examine the ritual code, we shall find that it contains no declaration which disclo-

sed the way whereby divine justice was satisfied, and remission obtained. If a man so much as tasted of an animal that was denominated unclean, or touched a corpse, or either killed a victim or offered it in sacrifice, in a manner which varied in the least from the prescription of the positive institute, he was a transgressor; and guilty as he was, the letter of the law did not teach him to found all his hope of pardon on the merits of the great antetypical Sacrifice. It is true, the ritual law had a spiritual import, and pointed to Christ as the only efficient sacrifice for sin; but its reference to the real atonement was not declared. The rights were enjoined, but no key of explanation was given. Its language defined the observances which it required, but not the typical meaning of those observances. In the case of ceremonial uncleanness, the people were referred to certain rites of purification. But the law informed them neither that this uncleanness was symbolical of moral pollution, nor that this purification was an emblem, and only an emblem, of that inward cleansing which could be effected by nothing short of the blood of Christ, and which they needed as much after the ritual solemnity, as before. What though they had annually a day of atonement, on which they were to 'afflict their souls, and offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord;' the law did not state the allusive design of the anniversary, nor interpret the spiritual import of the fiery offering. It used no language which plainly informed them that any of the rites which it enjoined, prefigured the Messiah, and the forgiveness of sin through his blood. The great mass of the Jews believed, contrary to the decision of the apostle, that it *was* 'possible for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sin;' and erroneous as their belief was, there was no expression in their law that contradicted it. And if any of them knew the typical meaning of their

rites, and understood the real ground of pardon, as numbers of them unquestionably did, they must have learned these things, not from the letter of their ritual, but from other portions of their sacred writings, or from their inspired prophets. What though, therefore, the ceremonial code did implicitly refer, throughout, to a dispensation of grace; it did not announce such a reference. What though it alluded to the only real mode of forgiveness; it neither explained nor asserted the allusion.

If we examine the moral branch of the law, it will appear that whatever it requires or forbids, is demanded or prohibited in the most absolute terms, without indicating so much as the *possibility* of mercy, in case of any future act of disobedience. The second commandment does indeed close with these words, 'shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments.' But if either the love or the obedience were interrupted, no encouragement could be derived from this language. 'Thou shalt,' and 'thou shalt not,' is the peremptory style of the Almighty Lawgiver; and on the subject of forgiveness after transgression, the Ten Commandments are profoundly silent. Not a breath of mercy is wafted from the decalogue to the ear of him who violates any one of its imperative enactments. God stands before us pointing at the whole moral code, and says, 'This do, and live;' but utters not a word to encourage hope, if so much as a fractional part of what is commanded, be left unperformed. Nay, so far is the moral law from giving the violator of it any hint of forgiveness, that we are given to understand that the transgression of any precept which it embodies, is virtually a transgression of the total mass of its precepts. 'Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, is guilty of all.' Law, whether divine or human, is, in strictness of speech, but a declaration of the demands of justice. But

as justice requires, not the forgiveness, but the punishment of the offender, it is plainly inconsistent that a law designed to establish and enforce the claims of justice, should contradict itself by any intimations of pardon; and there are no such intimations in the moral law. The condition is, 'This do and live;' and the doing is to extend to every precept. Whoever fails in any point of obedience, forfeits the life of his body and of his soul to inexorable justice. There the law, as such, leaves him, without affording him a gleam of hope in the mercy of an offended God.

Surely then, the thunder and lightnings, fire and smoke, darkness and tempest, which covered and rocked the mount, accorded with the nature of both the ceremonial and moral law, which God on that tremendous occasion delivered to Moses. How could Sinai but be in a flame, when such a law was proclaimed from its summit?

6. That awful scene harmonized with the *penalty* of the law. It denounced wrath against all who should in any instance transgress. Hence Moses said to the people, 'If thou wilt not hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to do *all* his commandments and statutes which I command thee this day, all these curses shall come upon thee and overtake thee. Cursed shalt thou be in the city, and cursed shalt thou be in the field. Cursed shall be thy basket and thy store. Cursed shall be the fruit of thy body, and the fruit of thy land, the increase of thy kine, and the flocks of thy sheep. Cursed shalt thou be when thou comest in, and cursed shalt thou be when thou goest out.' But to supercede the necessity of further quotation from the 28th of Deuteronomy, I need only observe, that fifty-four verses of that chapter are employed in denouncing the most dreadful curses of the Lord, against every soul of man who should violate any of the divine precepts. The moral law had not then,

and it has not now, any thing to say to mankind milder than this, 'Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them.' It said then, and it says now, 'The soul that sinneth, it shall die.' This is law; law in its justice, in its purity, in its glory. This is *the* law, which, in all its strictness and severity, the apostle pronounces to be 'holy, and just, and good.' And so far is it from revealing either the mode or the possibility of forgiveness, that in the case of any kind or degree of disobedience, it holds out to view nothing but wrath to the uttermost.

No wonder Paul denominates the law thus armed with penalties, 'the ministration of condemnation,' and 'the ministration of death.' No wonder he assures us that its 'letter killeth.' No wonder that all are now under its condemning sentence, till they escape the curses by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; for who has not transgressed both its letter and its spirit? And it is no wonder that at the giving of such a law, all Sinai should have been covered with darkness and tempest, and convulsed to its base with thunder, the sound of a trumpet, and the voice of God.

The subject suggests the following reflections:—

1. The keen distress of sinners under conviction, is neither needless, nor without cause. It may be scoffed at and despised by the thoughtless and the hardened. But the moral law with all its precepts and curses, is still in force; and no man who has been arraigned before mount Sinai, and made effectually to hear the thunders of this law, can make light of the agonies of a convicted soul. Let but 'the commandment come' home to your conscience by the power of the Holy Ghost, and not one of those who are now at ease in Zion, could enjoy another moment's rest, till either his heart was broken in penitence, or again hardened in sin. "By the law is the knowledge of sin." But the law never effectually reveals our

guilt to us, except when its extent, spirituality and penalty, are placed before us in an attitude that corresponds with the terrors of the mount. Repentance without a sense of guilt is impossible. But a sense of guilt,—of such amazing guilt as is disclosed to the anxious sinner by the instrumentality of the law, cannot exist without proportional anguish of mind. To prove that this anguish is needless, it must be proved that sin is no evil, and the curse of the law no cause of alarm; and to do this, it must be proved that the bible is not the word of the Eternal Lawgiver. He never forgives a sinner without the pains of compunction. And however you may regard those pains in persons under the discipline of that law which is “our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ,” *you* would not pardon even one of your equals, that had committed an atrocious crime against you, unless you saw him mourning over the injury, and feeling that you might justly follow him with a prosecution to the extremity of the civil law. And how is it possible for a long practised rebel against the infinite God to entertain, without great anguish of mind, a realizing sense of his guilt, and of the justice, goodness, and holiness of the law which sentences him to eternal punishment? No sinner sees the law in its true light, unless his view of it makes him “exceedingly fear and quake.” For, as a divine of the last century observes, “How terrible is the voice of the law as delivered at mount Sinai, and as roaring in the consciences of awakened sinners! It spreads blackness and darkness through their souls, burns like a tormenting fire within them, overwhelms them like an horrible tempest, summons them as with the sound of a trumpet to appear at God’s awful bar for judgment, and makes them dread,” as did the trembling Hebrews, “to hear any thing more of its rigorous terrors. Yea, the holiest men, like Moses himself, must tremble when they think of God’s infinite purity, and unyielding justice, as considered

only according to the tremendous revelation of them in his righteous law.”

2. It behooves all who belong to the New Testament church, to estimate the greatness of their privileges, and to live accordingly. It is scarcely possible for us, who have been favored with the almost superabundant light and blessings of the christian dispensation, to form an adequate conception of what our comparatively deplorable situation would have been, had we belonged to the Hebrew church, and stood trembling at the foot of Sinai, where all in the law was precept and penalty, and all in the visible scene was thunder, darkness, and tempest;—or what our situation would have been, had we lived in any period of the subsequent fifteen hundred years, and seen nothing of Christ except through the obscure medium of unexplained types and shadows. Dark and painful, and mostly unproductive of piety, was that long and desolate period. But

The Jewish wintry state is gone,
The mists are fled, the spring comes on,
The sacred turtle dove we hear,
Proclaims the new, the joyful year.

It is the year of lasting Jubilee to the church of God in this world; and it is our happy lot to enjoy the light, the knowledge, and all the privileges which it brings. How ought we, therefore, to live? Every one of us thus favored, ought to do more for Christ and his cause than was done by any saint under the law; for our enviable circumstances impose certain duties on us, which did not devolve on either Moses, David, or Isaiah. And how do we live? What are we doing to promote the kingdom of heaven within us, and around us? Enjoying as we do, nearly all the light that God ever intended to shed down from heaven upon the hill of Sion, can it be that we are drowsy and cold in his service? Having “come unto mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God,” can it be that we are worldly and inactive?—that we neither feel the spirit, nor

profit by the advantages, of a dispensation that has distinguished us above him who penned the Psalms, and above all the ancient descendants of Abraham?

3. All to whom the gospel is known, are under infinite obligations to embrace the Saviour immediately and enter the church under this, her last and brightest dispensation. No Israelite could be saved without repentance and faith. How much less, then, can you, to whom the nature and necessity of these holy exercises are clearly made known, and "before whose eyes Jesus Christ," the great antetype, "hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you?" It is not the voice of a trumpet that you hear, waxing louder and louder, and announcing the obligations of a burdensome ritual; but the voice of "the Mediator of a better covenant," who points first to Calvary, saying "Look unto me and be ye saved," and then to the sacrament of the Supper, saying, "Do this in remembrance of me." But alas! numbers of you refuse. You stand aloof both from Him and his table, as if the New Testament church had no more charms for you, than the church in the dark days of the Mosaic economy. O how different your feelings on this subject, from those of the enraptured apostle, who, in descanting in the context, on the privileges and glory of the Christian dispensation, proceeds in a strain of eloquence which has no parallel in any book but the bible.

Again; We are reminded of the aggravated guilt of impenitence under the gospel. There never was a dispensation which shed so much light upon our world. The darkness, severity and terror of the ritual economy, are fled away. You have no ignorance for God to wink at. The long typified Messiah has come. You understand his character, and the benevolent object for which he came. His blood—the *real* blood of sprinkling, has been shed; and you see him, the God-man, standing plainly before you, without the intervention of a sin-

gle type or shadow to obscure your view of him. But the greater your spiritual advantages, the greater is your guilt, if you neglect or misimprove them. So that if you perish, it will be under the double weight of a violated law and an abused gospel.

Finally: We are led to reflect on a scene that will be infinitely more dreadful than that at Sinai.

'Twas the same herald, and the trump the same

Which shall be blown by high command,
Shall bid the wheels of nature stand,
And heav'n's eternal will proclaim,
That 'Time shall be no more.'

The darkness and convulsion will not be confined to a single mountain, nor agitate the souls of only one trembling nation. The whole earth will tremble and reel. Every island, sea and mountain, shall flee away, and there shall be "found no place for them." All nations shall stand before the Son of man, and shall then understand what *law* is. Oh, if amid all the peculiar light and means, motives and blessings of such a dispensation as the one which you enjoy, any of you persist in rejecting the Lord that bought you, and in trampling on his blood,—it will be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon, and even for Jerusalem, than for you, when He who visited Sinai with tempest, shall set the whole earth in a blaze, and recompence fury to his adversaries. Flee, therefore, all of you who are without God and without hope in the world. Flee from the wrath to come. Flee from mount Sinai unto mount Sion, or the law which was given under circumstances so appalling, will be executed upon you in a more dreadful tempest, and neither Moses nor Jesus shall officiate as your Mediator.

For the Christian Spectator.

Reasons of the Christian's attachment to the Sanctuary.

"It is a grand point," says the eloquent Saurin "to be acquainted with the arguments which forcibly attach us to religion." "One thing," says

David, the inspired King of Israel, "have I desired of the Lord, that I will seek after: that I may dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of my life, to behold the beauty of the Lord and to enquire in his temple." An occasional visit it seems would not have satisfied *him*; he sought a permanent residence. As this is the language of one ardently attached to the place of divine worship, of one distinguished for piety, and designated by the highest appellation of dignity and honor, 'a man after God's own heart,'—every christian will feel not a little interest in ascertaining the considerations which gave the house of God so much value in his estimation. I shall in this essay dwell upon two only which swayed the mind of the Psalmist, viz. *the discovery of the divine excellency and glory obtained in the sanctuary: and the opportunity afforded there of gaining religious instruction.*

The Psalmist delighted to contemplate the divine character, wherever its glories were manifested. Sometimes we find him amid the stillness and grandeur of midnight, surveying the heavens, watching the stars and admiring the power and goodness that created them. Then we see him pondering upon the mysteries of providence, till lost and bewildered, he enters the sanctuary for additional light upon the ways of the Almighty, for a further explanation of the principles of his government. In the tabernacle, and afterwards in the temple, God more fully revealed himself: there he removed some of the clouds that are around about him. dissipated much of that darkness which enclose his throne, and made a clearer exhibition of his glory. It is in the house of worship that the christian 'beholds the beauty of the Lord.'

Would Jehovah have given such particular directions in the building of the temple, to every line its measure, to every pillar its dimensions, and to every pin its place, if he had not designed it as his own peculiar habitation? 'He seemed to with-

draw from the surrounding world all the rays of light and glory, to collect them into the Schekinah.' The sanctuary of the gospel, though not illumined with the splendors of a visible emblem, though not the depository of the ark, with its gold and its cherubims, 'the holy of holies' with its furniture and its mysteries, is still the place of deeper interest and more devout wonder, irradiated with clearer light, and sanctified by a diviner presence. These exhibitions of divine glory render the house of God, particularly desirable to every christian, because he loves the character of God.

There is a charm in moral excellence, a beauty in moral virtue, which calls forth his strongest affections. He who at first commanded light to shine out of darkness, has shone into his mind to give him the light of his own glory in the face of Jesus Christ, and by faith has given him the highest moral esteem for that glory, so that every new discovery fills him with warmer love and purer joy. It is natural to delight in a nature like our own, and to desire more intimate acquaintance with a character that commands our confidence and veneration. Christians are partakers of the divine nature, God is reconciled to them through Christ, not imputing unto them their sins; his character is not lighted up to their eye by the fire of his own indignation, but is shone upon and rendered glorious through the spirit, by the rays of the Sun of righteousness: they regard him as a Father assured that he acknowledges them as children; they trust in him as a Guardian, while they are constantly experiencing the shelter of his providence and the tenderness of his care; they rejoice in him as their Saviour, while he bestows upon them the benefits of redemption and makes them partakers of the inheritance of his saints. It was a principle of supreme love to God that caused David to utter that sublime ejaculation, 'whom have I in heaven but thee, and there is none on earth I desire beside thee.'

Christians, like David, desire to behold the beauty of the Lord, *from the effect which this discovery produces upon their hopes and graces and life.*

Whatever is evangelical in the experience, elevated in the character and holy in the life of the believer, is of heavenly origin; and can be invigorated and beautified only by an heavenly influence. The cares, pursuits, and trials of this life, operate like thick mists to obscure the prospects, or heavy dews to load the wings of faith. A constant succession of temporal business, the continual agitation of mind occasioned by loss and gain, induce a worldliness which, strengthened by natural propensity, rendered lawful by public opinion, and necessary by numerous wants, is very unfavourable to holy enjoyment and spiritual growth.—But the Sabbath is like a summer day, and the manifestation of the divine glory, like the sun and showers to the plants of grace. Were it not for the return of a day of sacred rest, and for the privilege of visiting the house of prayer, to behold the beauty of the Lord, hope would soon lose sight of its object, and the glories of the kingdom of God, being invisible to the “infirm eye of flesh,” would cease to awaken the desires, and engage the attention. A refreshing visitation of the light of the divine countenance, strengthens the hopes of the believer, and enables him to hold in steadier prospect the things which are above ‘where Christ sitteth on the right hand of the Father.’

The graces of the Spirit are revived by a manifestation of the divine glory. Love the divinest offspring of heaven, breathes a holier ardour, and receives a wider expansion in this sunlight of the soul. The friendship of this world is enmity with God, and consequently with every thing that partakes of his nature. Divine love that is shed abroad in the heart by the holy spirit, finds nothing here to inspire its exercises, and quicken its desires; the atmosphere of the world quenches the flame and chills its warmth. But ‘the beauty of the Lord’

shining upon his people gives purity to their feelings, vigor to their affections, and lustre to their virtues. Faith, which lives upon the word of God, is strengthened by every new discovery of the light of the knowledge of his glory shining in the face of Jesus Christ. The more excellency we perceive in the character of the Supreme Being, the firmer will be our reliance upon his promises; the clearer the manifestation, the higher will be the exercise of faith which is ‘the substance of things hoped for, and the evidence of things not seen.’ As faith looks not to those things which are temporal, but to those which are eternal, the views obtained in the sanctuary where the veil of the third heaven is partially withdrawn, and the mysteries of the New Covenant Ark are disclosed, conduce greatly to enlarge its vision and to invigorate its actings. The manner in which such a discovery produces deeper repentance, more unfeigned humility, is beautifully described by the patriarch Job, in his own personal experience, ‘I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear, but now mine eye seeth thee, wherefore I abhor myself and repent in dust and ashes.’

The benign and heavenly influence which such a shining of the divine beauty upon the soul, exerts upon every christian grace and virtue, is sufficiently proved from the fact, that all those eminent saints who reached the highest spiritual stature, and who possessed most of the spirit of religion, devoted much of their time to sacred worship, and were privileged with nearer approaches to the perfection of holiness. Abraham who attained unto the honor of being styled ‘the father of the faithful,’ was also called “the friend of God,” and enjoyed all the intimacy of unreserved intercourse. Enoch who was favored with an exemption from a conflict with death, ‘walked with God.’ Moses who was selected as the deliverer and lawgiver of Israel, was permitted to converse with God

as one converseth with his friend, and was blessed with some signal views of the divine glory. David whose memorial is eminently in heaven, passed many of his nights as well as his days with God. Isaiah, the evangelical prophet 'of seraphic fire,' 'saw the Lord sitting upon his throne and his train filled the temple.' Daniel, a man greatly beloved and as greatly distinguished, like Uriel, dwelt in the sun. Paul the great apostle of the Gentiles, whose life is a history of the church, had such a discovery of the resident excellence of Jehovah as is displayed in the third heaven, and as is neither lawful nor possible for man to describe. That much of the holiness which is the health and beauty of the soul, the ornament and glory of the christian character, is to be attributed to those manifestations of the glory of God with which these men were in their devotions favored, must be evident to any who will read their lives and trace the steps of their spiritual growth.

The effect of this discovery which is obtained in the sanctuary, upon the 'life of godliness' is direct and immediate. There is a principle of imitation planted deep in our nature, and perhaps in the nature of all moral beings, which insensibly and gradually produces a transformation into the likeness of those with whom our acquaintance is intimate and in whom our affections centre. There is an atmosphere around a great man, which, inhaled by those who admire greatness, will impart elevation to character,—an influence around a good man, which, felt by those who are charmed with moral excellence, will communicate purity to the heart, and rectitude to the life. To this principle is to be referred in no small degree the formation of social and national character; to this no doubt, the Apostle referred in his well known, but much neglected caution to christians, 'Be not conformed to this world; but be ye transformed by the renewing of your

mind, that ye may prove' that is, discern and approve (which will naturally affect the life,) 'what is that good and acceptable and perfect will of God.'

We can easily perceive then, how a much greater effect is produced upon our whole moral character and christian deportment by a clear and repeated discovery of uncreated excellence. Where the heart is right and a counteracting influence is removed, the transformation must be evident and rapid. This is beautifully expressed by an Apostle, and most satisfactorily confirms our remark:— 'But we all with open face, beholding as in a glass, the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image, from glory to glory, as by the Spirit of the Lord.'

The second consideration which gave so much interest and value, in the estimation of the Psalmist, to the house of the Lord, was *the opportunity afforded of obtaining religious instruction.*

Knowledge is the aliment of the soul; divine knowledge is the food of angels, the hidden manna of the kingdom. Its importance to the life and growth of religion is evident from the value which good men in every age have placed upon it and the eagerness with which it has been sought by them, as well as from the circumstance, that the bible which is our standard and rule, our light and guide, is full of the deep things of God. The king of Israel had constantly upon his lips this prayer; "Lord teach me thy statutes, and make me to understand thy testimonies: Open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law." The *means* by which this knowledge is communicated are the word and spirit of God. The *place* where David expected to receive this instruction was the temple: *there* was the Schechinàh resting over the mercy seat: *there* Jehovah had recorded his name and deposited his law; it was the oracle of God. Nor should the christian under the

gospel be less anxious to visit the sanctuary; it is the temple of divine wisdom, the gate of heaven, the place appointed for the dissemination of truth. As far as the instructions delivered there are illuminated by the heavenly ray, they are the truths of God, and ought to be received as such.

By 'enquiring in his temple,' by attending the public institutions of Christ's house, his people obtain a further knowledge of his character; for every doctrine exhibited, every truth unfolded, every precept enforced, derives its excellence and receives its value from him. They obtain a more intimate acquaintance with themselves, for the word which is preached is "quick and powerful and sharper than any two edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit and of the joints and marrow, and is a discernor" and *revealer* "of the thoughts and intents of the heart:" They obtain a more enlarged view of the mysteries of redemption; for Jesus Christ and him crucified, the wisdom of God and the power of God, the summary of the grand scheme of salvation, the substance of the mystery of godliness, God manifest in the flesh, the centre of light and radiance of divine truth, is the great subject of gospel preaching.

This important knowledge of the various parts of the system of inspired truth, which the christian desires to cultivate and improve by appearing in the courts of the Lord's house, is essential to growth in grace. That an individual can advance in the divine life while neglecting the means of its nourishment, or increase in conformity to God while ignorant of his character is a manifest absurdity. 'Truth is the instrument of holiness; "Sanctify them through thy truth, thy word is truth." The Savior's prayer respects the influence of truth, only when believed; of knowledge, only when acquired. At the commencement of the same prayer he says, "And this is eternal life," in

its inceptive stages as well as in its consummation, "that they might *know* thee, the only true God and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." "Seeing," says an apostle, "ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the spirit." Now the truth must be known, before it can be obeyed.

This knowledge of God and divine things is essential also to spiritual comfort. Purity of conscience, and peace in believing, constitute no inconsiderable part of christian consolation. These imply an acquaintance with the method in which the benefits of Christ's death are applied, for 'the blood of sprinkling' alone speaketh peace to the soul. The joy that arises from the exercise of animal feeling, or from mistaken assurances of personal safety, though satisfactory to those who know no other, is far from that holy and rational delight in God which every enlightened christian feels. 'In the multitude of my thoughts within me,' says the Psalmist of Israel, 'thy comforts delight my soul.' If a correct knowledge of the great truths of God is essential to any degree of true scriptural comfort, which differs on the one hand from stupid indifference, and animal feeling on the other, much more is it essential to any large measure of it. Nothing can be more erroneous, or contrary to the genius of the gospel, than the idea that all who are happy, are equally so. "A peasant and philosopher may be equally *satisfied*, but not equally *happy*. Happiness consists in the multiplicity of agreeable consciousness. A peasant has not capacity for having equal happiness with a philosopher." Enlargement of mind and extent of knowledge enter into our ideas of elevated and celestial felicity. There is refinement in religion as well as in manners. Rational divine joy differs as much from gross and ignorant satisfaction though arising from religious feeling, as gold in the mint from gold in the mine.

This acquaintance with religious truth is equally requisite to *the assurance of hope*. 'But sanctify the Lord God in your hearts,' says St. Peter, 'and be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you, with meekness and fear;' that hope, that arrives to assurance must be founded in evidence and endued with knowledge. Religion is supported by reason. The enlightened and established christian *knows* in whom he has believed. There is much confidence expressed of present enjoyment and future happiness, which, it is to be feared, arises from ignorance, and must end in disappointment. The apostle Paul, in his usually nervous and sensible language, adopted a manner of expression in reference to his personal interest in Christ which deserves the attention of all professed christians: 'I am now ready to be offered up, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course have kept the faith: Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me in that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing.' He speaks nothing of his former revelations, nothing of his remarkable conversion; nothing of his unparalleled success in preaching the gospel; but rests entirely upon the righteousness and mercy of God, to acquire and disseminate a knowledge of whose character and government constituted the business and happiness of his life.

I have illustrated the reasons which induce the christian to prize his religious privileges. I have said nothing of the divine command which is the ground of obligation to moral duty. I have only endeavored to trace the causes of attachment to the house of God, as they arise in the sanctified heart, that every believer might have a test of his piety, and that the charge of weakness and en-

thusiasm might be exposed and refuted. If any should account the solemnities of the sanctuary magnificent trifling, I would refer them to the sentiments of one at least of equal taste, and certainly not of inferior intellect, who sought his highest consolation in God, and esteemed a visit to his house 'privileged beyond the common walk of virtuous life, quite in the verge of heaven.' See the 84th Psalm, which for every thing that can delight and improve, exceeds the whole compass of uninspired writing.

'The beauty of the Lord' should excite as ardent an attachment in the bosom of every worshipper as in the mind of the 'man after God's own heart;' the knowledge of divine things ought to be as eagerly sought and as highly valued. For one who professes to worship David's God, and to believe the truths which filled his soul with light and his life with holiness, to undervalue or abandon the privileges of Christ's house, is to present a melancholy contrast to his devotion and piety.

I can never believe that man loves God, who does not love his house, nor consider him as an heir of grace, who prefers the dissipation and noise of the 'tents of wickedness,' to the solemnity and amiableness of the 'tabernacles of the Lord of Hosts.' Habitually to neglect or carelessly to attend the preaching of the gospel, evinces a stupidity of feeling and an alienation of affection too nearly allied to an entire corruption of the heart.

M. M.

For the Christian Spectator.

Remarks on Griesbach's Text of the New Testament.

That the celebrated Griesbach has rendered considerable service to one department of Biblical Literature, no well-informed person thinks of questioning. The very excessive praises however, which are sometimes bestowed upon him, do little toward illustrating the real value of his la-

bors, or permanently securing the degree of reputation to which he is fairly entitled. His *one hundred thousand* various readings, in hands well skilled in the displays of learning, can easily be so set off as to astonish a certain class of readers, and to gratify another. It is not a very difficult matter to impose upon persons who are not accustomed to go to original sources of knowledge, nor to please those who have no particular objections to see the truth undermined. It is quite possible to persuade either of these classes that, before the days of Griesbach, the faith of the church must have rested upon a very imperfect gospel, and almost that the salvation of the world depends upon the labors of that critic. It must therefore be with no little surprise that they open their eyes when they learn that the frightful *one hundred thousand* various readings, which they have seen so conspicuously associated with the name of Griesbach, are for the most part exceedingly minute and unimportant. This is nevertheless a fact, which, however warily overlooked sometimes, may defy contradiction from any quarter. Any person familiar with the Received Text, taking up Griesbach's, will find it very much the same Testament that he has always been accustomed to read. And upon the most careful inspection afterwards, he will find no reason for any very material change in his first impression. Thus much is very certain, that there is not one single important doctrine taught by the Received Text, which is not taught with equal clearness and force by the other. Griesbach has given us no other gospel than the one which we have always had. If he had never lived, we should still have had the same evangelical truths which we now have: we should still have had a New Testament without any material defect or error. In relation to the doctrine of the Trinity, I. John, v. 7. is the only verse which he has expunged, and an exceedingly small number besides at all amended—none

of them essential to the support of that doctrine. Exaggerations are apt to have a reaction. Let us therefore not labor to extol Griesbach's name too highly. No man ever maintained that transcribers and editors were inspired; or that they were never liable to misplace a word, or change a vowel, or omit a particle. Yet such are for the most part the kind of mistakes which are sometimes cried up to such a prodigious amount. If this fact was always distinctly stated, when the praises of Griesbach are the theme, the importance of his services to the cause of substantial truth, would not be so often raised to a dangerous elevation. We admire the critic for his learning, and no less for his extraordinary patience in attending for years together to very minute things. We thank him too for the new and interesting light which he has thrown upon several passages by his emendations. But most of all are we indebted to him for the new demonstration which he has indirectly and unconsciously afforded that the great doctrines of the gospel cannot by any means be shaken.

If Griesbach, and his predecessors in the same course of study, Mill and Wetstein, have applied such prodigious talents and learning, with such diligence, for so long a time, and with such superior advantages as to manuscripts, &c., and yet have left the New Testament substantially as they found it, notwithstanding Griesbach's manifest prejudice against the Received Text; and if moreover the Received Text was prepared by Erasmus, as well as he *could* prepare it, when under every disadvantage:—the whole proves at least that a very remarkable providence must have guided the hands which have transmitted the gospel down to the age in which we live. Our confidence in the genuineness of the New Testament is often strengthened by the very statements which seem designed to impair it.

But admitting that the Amended Text has its value, and that profi-

ciency in criticism is always a desirable and often a highly useful attainment,—yet it must not be forgotten that there are other qualifications which are indispensable to a correct and successful investigation of divine truth. There are treasures in the scriptures which no mere learned research, or critical skill, can find. “Wherefore is there a price in the hand of a fool to get wisdom, seeing he hath no heart to it.” And it is a consoling thought that with the endowment which ‘guides into all truth,’ the plainest christian becomes ‘wise unto salvation,’ with an imperfect version of an imperfect text. With this qualification mere ‘babes’ know more of the bible than all the ‘wise and prudent’ of this world. “Alas!” (was the affecting lamentation of the learned Grotius, on his death bed) “alas! I have wasted my life in laboriously doing nothing!” And he would gladly have changed places with John Urick, an obscure neighbor, who was at the same time breathing out his soul in the triumphs of faith. The kingdom of heaven is compared to ‘a treasure hid in a field.’ There have been many learned men, who, instead of searching for the treasure, have wasted their days in repairing every little breach in the fence around it, and searching for every minute piece of the ancient materials. They have the rewards of fame for having been patient, laborious, and learned; but, alas! not a few of them, there is reason to fear, have died without the ‘treasure.’

Who does not pity them? Poor Urick cared nothing about the fence, but made sure of the treasure. And when we are told that the man, who findeth the treasure, *hideth it*; we cannot but be reminded of the precautions which are necessary to guard against the various arts of those who would steal away all that is precious in the gospel.

Though Griesbach has made some valuable emendations, yet they are far from being all such. In a number of instances he has introduced his alterations where the Received Text was unquestionably right; and thus marred the beauty and consistency of the sacred writings. This is not to be wondered at when we consider the very unfair use which he has made of the Received Text, his unwarrantable classification of many of the manuscripts, and especially the absurdity of some of his rules for selecting the right reading. Two of these rules are the following:—“A reading calculated more than others to *nourish piety* (especially monastic) is suspected.” “Amongst various reading that which beyond the rest manifestly favors the *orthodox* is deservedly suspected.” Vol. I. p. 13. Cambridge Edition. 1809.

As however the American public may shortly expect more and better light on the whole of this subject than they have hitherto been favored with, I shall here close my remarks, having already pursued them further than I intended. V.

Miscellaneous.

On Party Spirit as connected with Religion.

The evils of *Party Spirit* have been often delineated in stronger colors than I can pretend to use. It destroys mutual confidence, and brings in its place, jealousies, distrusts, plots and counterplots: it ban-

ishes candor, and introduces perversion and misrepresentation; it violates the ties of blood and affection, and separates ‘very friends;’ it makes enemies of those who would otherwise ‘mingle like kindred drops,’ and unite, heart and hand, in promoting the public weal; it tramples upon

every moral obligation, and makes the pernicious maxim, that 'all is fair in politics' a rule of action in *public* life, to men, whose *private* walk is most pure and upright. A single division of this kind, marred all the delights of society in our land, for more than twenty years. Its downfall was hailed with joy by every good man.

There have, indeed, always been divisions among us. The *ins* and the *outs* are, very naturally, opposed to each other. But, in very few instances, have these parties owed their existence to a difference of principle. Neither have they been as virulent in their character, as they formerly were. A desire to caution my fellow-citizens against forming such divisions on a *religious* account, has occasioned the present remarks.

I think it is no uncommon thing, in many parts of our country, in the strife for office which the present times have produced, for the friends of one candidate or the other, when reason and argument have failed to stimulate a partisan or win over an opponent, to appeal to *religious* prejudices of some sort, and thus endeavor to blind the eyes and warp the judgment, instead of resting their cause on the actual fitness or unfitness of the candidates for the office in question. I know that 'when the righteous are in authority, the people rejoice; but when the wicked beareth rule, the people mourn.' No doubt it would be happy for a nation, on *many* accounts, if all its rulers practically 'feared God, and wrought righteousness.' *Other things being equal*, the preference is greatly to be given, in the choice of public officers, to men of decided piety. Nay, even a speculative belief in christianity is far better than open infidelity. The influence of public men upon the character of community is so great as to render it a 'consummation devoutly to be wished,' that our rulers should be Joshuas and Alfreds, and our Judges, Daniels and Hales. But I very much misunderstand the meaning of

the inspired writings, if the wise man intended to set forth *piety* as the *only* qualification for public office.

In a free, elective government like our own, it is, unquestionably, both a privilege and a duty of the christian, as of others, to exercise the right of suffrage; and he ought to do this, like every other action, conscientiously 'to the glory of God.' No selfish passion should pervert his judgment; no show of talents should dazzle his eyes. But, in simplicity and sincerity, he should support those men whose promotion will best subserve the public good. In case *none* of the prominent candidates are pious, I do not perceive that he ought to throw away his vote, by giving it to a man who stands no chance of being elected. Under such circumstances, it would seem to be the dictate of common sense, not contradicted by religion, to vote for the candidate who is *best qualified* for the post. And even if *one* of the candidates is pious and the other not, it by no means follows, that the former is, of course, the most suitable person to be elected to office. 'The *poor* man, by his *wisdom*, saved the city.' The *pious* man, by his prayers, by his good example, by his influence in his own *private circle*, may do much to save the nation. But he may not have the requisite talents for business, or such firmness and independence or vigor and energy of character, or skill in discerning the hidden purposes of men, or such rule over his own spirit, as are necessary in one who occupies a public station. Nay, though his piety may be unquestionable, as far as human eyes can see, yet ambition may be his weak point, the love of popularity, or the *auri sacra fames* his besetting master sin, which will lead him, insensibly, away from the path of integrity. On the other hand, we see men, who neither appear nor profess to be real christians, who yet, by their capacity, wisdom and integrity, deserve and obtain the confidence of their fellow-citizens. By the admission of all, excepting avowed *athe-*

ists, to the solemnities of an oath, we practically say that the generality of men may be safely supposed to act under a sense of moral accountability and to be restrained by considerations of an hereafter. Consequently, it may be expected, that they will conduct themselves according to their capacities, with an ordinary degree of fidelity, if promoted to office. Alas! in this sinful state, with how little success can we look for more, from men professedly pious. The rule seems to be that, among men whose talents qualify them for a particular office, the christian should give his suffrages for the *best* man who can be voted for, *with a reasonable prospect of success*.

If I mistake not, there is a kind of party feeling in some of the States, of an evil character, which has yet escaped the notice of many good men. Within these ten years, it has so fallen out, in the providence of God, that an unusual proportion of public men, have witnessed a good profession of sound piety and scriptural faith. It is not only natural, but laudable, that men of talents, influence, and habits of business, who have always been accustomed to take a part in public affairs, should still feel a deep interest in them, and wish to share in their management. Every man wishes to enjoy his portion of public respect. Particularly do those who have been used to enjoy the confidence of their rulers and fellow-citizens, acutely feel the loss of that confidence. Men who are in the habit of depending upon the emoluments of office for support, and who have withdrawn themselves from other pursuits for the public service, will not be expected entirely to suppress the sense of indignation at finding themselves left out of employment, for no fault but their activity in supporting the honor of their Savior and the truths of the gospel, and in advancing the kingdom of righteousness upon earth.

Further, there has prevailed in the community a deeper sense of the value of personal religion, as a security for the faithful performance of our so-

cial duties. They who have learned in the school of Christ the natural pride and selfishness of the heart, best know how much all and particularly public men, need divine grace, to preserve their integrity, and overcome their temptations. It is not strange that those who love christians and value piety in public men, both for example's sake and as additional security against improper conduct, should grieve to find public honors and the power of the States, engrossed by men of an opposite character. If pious people find, or think they find cases like those here specified, multiplying, and apparently reduced to a system by those who are at the head of affairs, there is great *danger* that they will form themselves into a *party*, for the purpose of giving a share in the government to men in whom they place more confidence.

Let them beware of such a course. When once such a party is formed, it becomes liable to that peculiar rancor which has always distinguished *religious* quarrels. It exasperates the feelings of their opponents, and hardens them more and more against the reception of the truth. It is likewise attended with all the usual evils of party spirit. Its leaders (for every party will have its leaders,) in order to effect their object, must associate themselves with men of influence, whether pious or not. They must consider all, as of their party, who are willing to pronounce the *shibboleth* of orthodoxy, no matter what may be their private character. If successful, they must feel themselves indebted for their success to the active support of such men; and must reward their faithful services with a liberal share of public honors. This violates directly the first principle of their party creed, 'to place the power and influence of public stations wholly on the side of vital piety.' They lay a bait before the ambitious and aspiring, to make them zealous in behalf of the true faith, *for the sake of rising in their political career*, without

being careful to possess inward religion. They mislead the young and unwary, sanction self-righteousness, and suffer the idea to prevail that merely belonging to an orthodox party confers a sufficient title to the christian character. They are, themselves, tempted to employ against their opponents the usual engines of party warfare, misrepresentation, intrigue and corruption. In the bustle of political strife, they lose all spirituality, tenderness of conscience, love for souls and zeal in the cause of their Redeemer; and, for all this, they find themselves perpetually unsuccessful. The reason is obvious. They are not thorough-going politicians. They cannot rid themselves of the restraints of conscience, so as to employ the complex machinery of politics with effect.

But there is a still stronger reason why *christians*, combining themselves in a *party* for such purposes, must fail of success. *They are acting out of the sphere of duty, and consequently WITHOUT THE DIVINE BLESSING.* 'Christ's kingdom is not of this world.' It is neither to be extended nor upheld by the civil power. Its weapons of warfare are, 'not carnal, but spiritual.' Its prosperity is best promoted by prayer, by holy living, by a spiritual conversation. The seasons when it has been most patronized by earthly rulers for political purposes, have been the darkest periods in the history of the church. Neither force, nor intrigue, nor flattery, nor corruption, are proper instruments to be used in advancing the cause of religion. 'He that is greatest among you, let him be the least' cuts up ambition by the roots.

Let the friends of Zion labor in their respective spheres, to convert sinners. Let them cause 'their light so to shine before men, that others, seeing their good works, may glorify our Father which is in Heaven.' Let them show the nature of their religion by a conscientious discharge of every political and social duty.

In this way, they can truly promote that 'righteousness which exalteth a nation,' far more effectually than by political manœuvres and party zeal. In such a course they may ask, and confidently hope to obtain, the blessing of God. If called by Providence to a public station, let them use the power and influence of their station for the glory of the Redeemer. If they cannot *fairly* obtain a share in the management of public affairs, without resorting to intrigue or party spirit,—though the true church may be oppressed, and, to human view, the republic may seem hastening to its ruin; let them trust their own interests, the public welfare, and the safety of the church, to *His* care who has said, 'Fear not, little flock, for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom.'

LEGULEIUS.

To the Editor of the Christian Spectator.
MR. EDITOR,

Although I am one of those who do not approve of the practice of finding fault on every occasion, yet I believe there are times when remonstrance, or even complaint, is a duty. But in order that you may more fully understand what I have to say, I must give you a very brief account of myself; and in doing this I shall mention a few traits only in my character which relate immediately to the subject of which I am to speak. You must know then, that I am a plain man, who live in one of our largest villages; and though I say it myself, I am esteemed not the least wealthy man in the place. I profess to be a sober, moral man, who pay every man his due, live peaceably and honestly with all my neighbors, and have the respect of a large circle of acquaintances. I have always been particular in paying my debts and taxes, and have used my influence on the side of peace and good order. If Mr. Editor, you have ever attended meeting in our village, (I mean on

the Sabbath, for I never have time to attend on week days,) you have probably noticed me as I led my large family up the middle aisle, and placed them in one of the most costly pews in the house. For five and twenty years, Mr. Editor, I have scarcely ever missed being at my post on the Sabbath: so that I am sure to be one of the very first to notice every stranger, or fashion, or new dress that makes its appearance. As I think it becomes a man in my situation to make a respectable appearance, I have taken care to have my family dress and appear well, and in this respect am generally gratified.

I mention these things only to shew you, Mr. Editor, what kind of a personage I am, in order that I may better state to you my grievances, and ask you to take up your pen, and endeavour to give me redress. I hate long prefaces, and so I come at once to the point. It is simply this: Our minister and myself have lately fallen out; or rather, I have fallen out with him, for he seems to be such a stubborn sort of a man, that he wont quarrel with me. And what is still worse, he is such a kind of intriguing, artful man, that he has almost the whole parish on his side; so that with all the strength I can muster, I see no prospect of redress. The point of our difference is this: I, being a man of considerable business, and withal, according to the good scripture maxim, "*diligent* in business," am apt to sleep during meeting time. Now, although it would seem as if this was a very trifling affair, on which to found a quarrel, yet if you knew the whole circumstances, you could not find it in your heart to blame me.

Under our good old parson, Mr. Aimwell, (blessings on his memory!) the state of things was far different. In *his* day, we used to hear his text, and then, if occasion required, lay down our heads and take a nap. To be sure, we did not go to meeting on purpose to sleep, but when

once there, and we felt drowsy, it was considered more genteel to hold down the head, and sleep soundly, than to sit upright and nod. Our pastor used to say that it was more respectable to keep awake, through the whole service; but he was of an easy, plastic make, and never offended any by the severity of his reproofs. Besides, the good man would in a manner excuse us, for he would often tell us from the Bible, that "the spirit was willing, though the flesh was weak." Ah! these were days of peace, when we sat, "every man under his own vine and fig-tree, having none to molest or make him afraid."

You know, Mr. Editor, that great rivers rise from small sources. It is thus that my dislike to our present minister has increased by degrees; for I am so great a lover of peace, and so small was my animosity at first, that I can hardly tell how my antipathy towards him commenced. But I believe the occasion was this; on a warm sabbath in June, after being tired by a hard week's work, myself, and a number of others, happened to fall asleep during meeting time. When the sermon was about two thirds through, our preacher stopped suddenly, and stood keenly eyeing his audience. We all suddenly started up, and were wondering what could be the matter, when he coolly observed, that he "presumed by the appearance, the audience was displeased with his sermon; but," continued he, as he deliberately put his hand into his pocket, and drew out a new sermon—"I have another!" With that, he began and compelled us to sit and hear the whole of it. I was not a little mortified at this, especially as I presumed he would not have done it, had he not observed me among the sleepers. This reproof, I considered far too heavy for so trifling a fault. But this was not all. A little after this, he even had the boldness to preach directly against the sin of sleeping in meeting time; and he has such a

grave disagreeable solemnity in his voice and manner, that it makes one feel very badly. I supposed too, very naturally, that this discourse was levelled directly against myself. From this time I began to feel very sore towards our minister, for no one likes to have his little faults told before every body. I now concluded, much against my practice and conscience, that I would stay at home, and not attend meeting. But I soon became sick of this plan; for I had been absent only two sabbaths, when he called on me; he said he had observed me to be absent from meeting, and he came to see me, presuming I was sick. Not knowing exactly how to get along smoothly, I replied that I was quite unwell. Upon this, in his apparently friendly, and solemn manner, he gave me a most tremendous lecture on the duty of being prepared for death, and of my peculiar need of preparation. He did this so artfully, yet with such apparent plainness and sincerity, that I could not for my life be openly offended with him: but I have taken good care not to be absent from meeting since; for I would rather hear twenty sermons from the pulpit, than another like that, and I am sure they would not make me feel half as bad. But as I before observed, I am such a quiet, peaceable man, that I hate even now to break out into an open quarrel.

It generally happens that when a man has a wound on a very exposed part of his body, it is very apt to get injured or irritated. So it has been with me: for although my minister has not seen fit to attack me directly since, yet other circumstances have occurred to increase my aversion towards him. Of these you shall hear and judge. On one warm sabbath afternoon, when I was unusually dull, and when I was fast asleep, I received what I call a great insult, beside being frightened. When the service was almost half through, a young man, one of my neighbours, who for some time had been deranged, came

into the house. He enters very softly, walks through the aisle, and ascends the pulpit steps till he reaches the broad stair, when he turns round and views the audience. Seeing me with my head down and asleep, the rogue puts his hand into his pocket, and draws out a large apple, and with all his strength throws it at my head. Though it did not actually hit me, yet it gave me a prodigious fright. The minister stopped and turned round towards the fellow; "O," says he with an arch look, "you keep preaching—I'll keep him awake!!" You can easily imagine Mr. Editor, that I felt rather uncomfortable, as I roused up, quaking with fear, and saw the whole congregation staring at me, while many looked as if they would have sneered, had it not been on the sabbath. Although I never absolutely heard that my minister said much about this circumstance, yet I cannot but believe he was secretly rejoiced at my disgrace, and when alone, laughed at my cost. I must confess, I supposed he would have made a handle of this affair, and made me the jest of the whole parish. But he is so artful and cunning, that I never know where to find him, and when I expect to see him in a passion with me, he is as calm as a clock.

I might go on, Mr. Editor, to tell you a long list of grievances, for I find it does one good to have some one he can complain to; but I trust I have already said enough to show you how much my feelings have been injured. I have been trying of late to convince our parish, that the "influence of our minister is at an end;" and consequently, that he ought to be dismissed; but I am grieved to find, that by some means or other, of which I am totally ignorant, he has so infatuated his people, that scarcely one will think as I do on this subject. I can only add, that I think ministers have no right to take notice of such private affairs as sleeping in churches; and if they do so, they are uncivil and ungenerous. As no man ought to be

called to account for the manner in which he spends his time in meeting, unless he disturbs people by his noise, it follows, that ministers who thus call their hearers to account, *are to blame*, and ought to be dismissed. I am not able to say all I feel on this subject and occasion; but I do hope, Mr. Editor, that you will take your quill and teach ministers their duty in this respect.

O. E*****.

To the Editor of the Christian Spectator.

A part of the following poem was formerly inserted in a newspaper. Some friends, in whose judgment the author feels himself bound to acquiesce, have expressed a desire to see it published entire, and in a more permanent form. It is therefore at your disposal.

yours, L. L.

And the waters murmuring,
With such concert as they keep,
Entice the dewey feathered Sleep;
And let some strange mysterious dream
Wave at his wing, in airy stream
Of lively portraiture display'd.
Milton's Il. Penseroso.

Yes, there are dreams,—such dreams
are not of earth,—
Dreams when the cares and tumults of this
world
Are all forgot, as if they ne'er had been.—
When anxious fears and sad remembrances
A moment sleep; while blithe and glad-
some Hope
And bright-faced Memory awake by turns
Their soothing melodies; and crown'd
with flowers
Imagination strikes her golden harp
To join with them in concert,—then the
soul
Lull'd by their music into soft repose
Enjoys a rapture which is not of earth.
'Twas in the shelter of a bowery wood,
Along whose topmost boughs the summer
gale
Moved lightly with a gentle murmuring,
As if the spirit of the wind did love
To dwell upon a scene so fair as this;—
Beneath the shadow of a spreading oak
Whose roots were watered by a lovelier
stream
Than poet ever knew, I laid me down,—
Fatigued with wandering,—on the grassy
turf.
There as I lay outstretched beneath the
shade,
I gazed upon the tranquil firmament,
Boundless, and changeless, like eternity—
Unchanged—it is the same clear glorious
heaven
On which I gazed in earlier infancy;—

Unchanged—it is the same blue firmament,
Beneath whose arch the habitants of earth
Have lived and perished, since their com-
mon sire

First saw its glory and adored its maker.

Thus as I lay, methought our days on
earth

Pass even like "a story" or "a song,"

We hear it,—it is gone:—the heavens and
earth

Remain the same, but fleeting man must
change,—

And change,—and die.—My days of in-
fancy

Were they not days of thoughtlessness and
joy?

But childhood passes "like the early
dew"

Was it a dream? I saw the forest dark

Where I was wont to roam in early days,
And e'en in childhood dream of poesy.

Was it a dream? I heard the babbling
brook,

And gazed delighted on the clear bright
wave

Where I was wont to lave my infant limbs.
I saw the sun go down, the western sky

Kindling and reddening with the glorious
hues

Where childish fancy loved in sport to
trace

A thousand shapes and strange resemblances;—

And while I gazed I heard the whip-poor-
will

Awake her melancholy evening song.

Was it a dream? I climb'd my father's
knee,

I heard the mellow accents of his tongue
Sound like the music of departed years.

I hung in rapture on his lips, and heard
The woes and dangers of his former days,
The wonders he had seen, the fears and
hopes,

And anxious warnings of paternal care,
While "from his watch-tower" in the
woods the owl

With solemn music filled up every pause;—
And when the distant wolf howl'd fear-
fully.

Startling the cradled infant in its sleep
I press'd his bosom with a closer grasp.

Oh! it was not a dream; for on my
cheek

Glowed the warm kisses of maternal love,
And softly whispering, through my ravish'd
ears

Thrill'd the sweet numbers of my sister's
voice

Tuning with cherub notes her evening
song

Of simple praise, and simple melody.

Alas! that from such dreams of fancied
joy,

We must awake to sad reality.

So the poor sailor, toss'd upon the wave,
Dreams of his distant home, but wakes
and hears

The roaring of the ocean.

Then again
 I slumbered, for I seem'd to pass away
 Calmly and gently, like the placid spirit
 Of an infant dying in its mothers arms: —
 Methought I left behind me all these clogs
 And this vile burthen of mortality
 And rising on a seraph's pinions, soar'd
 Through the pure fields of ether, till afar
 I saw the battlements of heaven, and
 heard
 The loud sweet music of the holy quires
 Answering each other in their songs of
 joy.
 Still I passed onward,—and the angel bands
 Anon came flying by me as they went
 With eager haste on messages of love.
 The rushing of their wings was like the
 flow
 Of gentle waters mingling with the sound
 Of some soft melody by moonlight;—now
 Their forms came by me like the rapid
 streams
 Of glory flashing o'er the northern sky;
 Then would they glide in solemn majesty,
 And I beheld their forms of light, and
 knew
 That they were spirits of departed men.
 Some I beheld whose countenances
 seem'd

Familiar, like a long forgotten tale;
 Methought I once had seen them on the
 earth

Moving around me in the ranks of life,
 Then vanishing, while e'en their memory
 Died in oblivion, and their nameless graves
 Were trampled on by strangers; they did
 smile

Upon me in their flight, as if to hail
 My coming to their bowers.—

But who are these?—

Yes, I do know you, ye bright angel forms,
 Beautiful spirits! ye who often loved
 To visit me, to hover o'er my couch
 And hold communion with me in the hour
 Of midnight meditation.—Thou art he—
 How well the crown of life becomes thy
 brow;—

Now we do meet to part no more;—and
 thou

Bright cherub with the wreath of am-
 aranth;

We part no more.—

O, when shall I awake

And find that life with all its joys and griefs,
 Its light and shade, its tumult, and its wo,
 Is but a dream?

Review of New Publications.

Views of Calvinism, by PROFESSOR
 NORTON. *From the Christian Dis-*
ciple, pp. 40, 8vo. 1822.

WITH the history of this pamphlet, our readers are already acquainted. Occasioned, as it was, by some animadversions of our own on a former tract of Professor Norton, and abounding, as it does, in personal reproaches, it may be supposed that we recur to it with some measure of that feeling which petulance and invective are so apt to awaken. Whatever may be the tendencies of our common nature in this respect, we have been satisfied since the publication of the "Views of Calvinism," with a dispassionate vindication of ourselves from some personal charges of the author, and with entire quietness of spirit, have consulted our own leisure and convenience in preparing a further notice of his production. The principal reason which induces us to notice it at all, is that it brings into

discussion a subject which we regard as lying at the foundation of the controversy between Unitarians and the Orthodox. "What is Calvinism," especially on the article of human depravity, is the enquiry to which we are led by the pamphlet before us. To this enquiry, we attach a high importance, not only because in our opinion, the belief or rejection of this doctrine involves the belief or rejection of the whole Gospel, but also on account of the *form* in which the subject is presented. No religious controversy, we believe, can be long protracted, except as a conflict of the passions, when the doctrines in question are reduced to a statement in which the parties agree, and which both understand alike. And no controversy can ever have an end, until this point is attained, for the object of attack and defence is not the same. The question then "what is Calvinism on the article of human depravity," must be settled, before the pres-

ent discussion can be brought to a successful issue. The strength of orthodoxy lies in that accuracy of statement, which shall expose by its own perspicuity and precision, the misrepresentations and evasions of its doctrines; and we have no apprehensions for its complete triumph, when its friends by keeping their opponents to the point, shall bring them into direct conflict.

Professor Norton's 'Views of Calvinism' on the doctrine of depravity, in which he agrees substantially with all Unitarian writers, are summed up by himself, in a single proposition. "I now affirm it to be a doctrine of Calvinism," says he, "that *God creates men with a sinful nature.*" We need not say, that more is here ascribed to Calvinists, than is contained in the two independent positions, that God is the creator of men, and that men have in fact a sinful nature, from some other source than creation. The whole weight of Professor Norton's statement is, that Calvinists charge the sinful nature of men upon God as its *author* at the formation of their being. By the term "nature" as used by Professor N. is meant, not a state of voluntary moral action, but the original *structure and constitution* of our being; for it is a *created nature* of which he speaks, an effect of God's agency alone, and of course a nature prior to and independent of human action. Depravity in such a nature, must therefore be a **PHYSICAL PROPERTY*** of which God is the *efficient cause*.

We have but one remark to add in settling the question at issue. The position that "God creates men with a sinful nature," is not stated by Professor N. as an **INFERENCE**, which *he* makes, or which ought to be made from the system of Calvinists; but as an avowed part of that system--a principle of belief--a "**DOCTRINE**" of Calvinism. He has therefore narrowed the

* By a physical property we do not mean any thing material, but a property in the structure of the soul, in its formation by God.

question to a single point. The consistency of Calvinism with itself or with the great principles of natural and revealed religion, is not the subject in debate. The unavoidable inferences from this system are not the subject in debate. The sole question is what is the "doctrine,"—the *faith* of Calvinists respecting human depravity; and what are the inferences which *they* have made, or admitted, for such only can be a part of their system of belief. Were any authority necessary for thus limiting the question, it is furnished by Professor N. himself. Speaking of the doctrine that "God is morally accountable for the sins of men," he says; "it may be an unavoidable inference from his (Calvin's) system, but it is not one to be found in any Calvinistic authority, and I have not, therefore affirmed it to be a part of the Calvinistic creed." On his own principle then (the obvious dictate of integrity and honour) Professor N. is bound to exclude from the present discussion, likewise, every inference however "unavoidable" he may regard it, which is "not to be found in any Calvinistic authority."

With these views respecting the state of the controversy we remark;

1. That the passages quoted by Professor N. from Calvin, from the Westminster divines, and from Edwards, furnish no warrant for ascribing to these authors, the doctrine specified. We shall first examine such passages from Calvin as we suppose will be a fair specimen of the whole.

I confess that in original sin are comprehended blindness of mind, and perversity of heart; so that we are entirely despoiled and destitute of every thing connected with eternal life; so that even our very natural faculties are all depraved and contaminated. Whence is it that we are moved from within by no thought to do well. Wherefore I detest those who ascribe to us any freedom of will, by which we may prepare ourselves to receive the grace of God; or by which we may of ourselves co-operate with the Holy Spirit, which may be given us.—p. 10.

We are every one of us born infected with original sin, and from our mother's womb are under the curse of God, and a

sentence of damnation—*ab ipso matris utero a Deo maledicti ac damnati*—and this not on account of another's sin only, but on account of the wickedness, which is within us even when it does not show itself.—p. 10.

Calvin defines original sin to be "the hereditary depravity and corruption of our nature, extending to every part of the mind, which, in the first place, makes us justly liable to the wrath of God; (*quæ primum facit reos iræ Dei*;) and next produces those works in us, which the Scripture calls the works of the flesh."—p. 12.

"And so even infants bring their damnation with them from their mothers' womb; for although they have not yet produced the fruits of their iniquity, they have the seed of it inclosed within them. Nay, their whole nature is, as it were, a seed of sin; so that it cannot be otherwise than odious and abominable to God."—p. 17.

"Paul bears testimony that WE ARE BORN WITH SIN, as serpents bring their poison with them from the womb." "Where there is *condemnation*, there must of necessity be sin, because God is angry not with innocent men, but with sin." Upon this, he says, a question may arise; "how seeing that God is the author of nature, he can be without blame, if we are ruined by nature?" "I answer" he says, "that there are two kinds of nature, the first was originally made by God, the second is the corruption of the former. The *condemnation*, therefore, of which Paul speaks, by no means flows from God; but from a depraved nature, because we are not now born as Adam was created in the beginning; but are an adulterate seed from a degenerate and corrupt man."—p. 34.

Not one of these passages, our readers instantly perceive, supports in direct terms the statement of Professor Norton. The depravity of man they assert in the strongest language, that he is sinful even from the womb, but they do not charge this depravity on God, or give the most distant intimation that He "*creates* men with a sinful nature." Not a single passage does Professor N. claim to have found (and not one we are confident can he find in this or in any writer) which contains *in totidem verbis*, the doctrine ascribed to Calvinists. It is wholly a matter of *inference* from what Calvin has said, to what he *must* have believed. But is it not most extraordinary that a doctrine of this

kind, if really maintained, should never in a single instance, have been stated in direct terms by Calvin or any one of his followers? no, not even as an inference which might be justly derived from their system? Is not silence, under these circumstances, almost a demonstrative proof that whatever they ought to have done in Professor Norton's opinion, as sound reasoners, they never did in fact make this inference, or believe in the doctrine imputed to them?

Will Professor N. say that in the nature of things, no man can believe what Calvin has said, without involving the belief of the inference imputed? This is not true. Many divines have believed the one, and rejected the other.* Will he say that no man can do it *consistently*? But Calvin's consistency is not in question. We are not sitting in judgment on his abilities as a reasoner but enquiring concerning his faith as a divine. It is no new thing for a man to be inconsistent, and indeed according to Professor Norton's representations, Calvin was rather remarkable for this very failing. Since then Calvin has not in a single instance stated as a doctrine or an inference of his system, "that God creates men with a sinful nature," Professor N. cannot impute to him this inference as a part of his belief, without violating that obvious principle of justice stated by himself, to which we have already alluded.

We might leave the subject here;

* "When God forms the souls of infants" says Dr. Emmons, "he forms them with moral powers and makes them men in miniature. It is just as easy therefore to account for moral depravity in infancy, as at any other period of life."—Nor in respect to principle, does Dr. Ware differ materially from Dr. E——. Thus he expressly affirms, that, "a child—is capable of moral qualities;" and also ascribes moral qualities, to those of whom he says, "these appear to have been *infants*, or at least *verysmall* children, for he took them in his arms &c." Lett. p. 30. Ans. p. 14.—We shall shew in a subsequent part of the discussion, that some of the most distinguished followers of Calvin, have adopted his language as quoted by Professor N. and explicitly disclaimed the inference.

but a single word, will explain the source of Professor Norton's error. He assumes it as an undeniable principle, that whatever we are by birth, we are such by creation. Thus he says "if it can be proved to be a doctrine of Calvinism, that we the descendants of Adam are not born as God has formed us, or in other words that men are not *now* created by God, I will readily admit that it is not a doctrine of Calvinism, that "men are created by God with sinful natures." Now it is possible for Calvinists to maintain that although God creates men, they are moral agents from their birth, and can therefore be from their birth, what God has not created them, sinners by their own act. Such is the opinion of Dr. Emmons and substantially of Dr. Ware, and others. It is likewise possible to believe that God creates men with their natural faculties merely, and leaves them destitute of his grace and of original righteousness; and to consider this state of privation or desertion as sinful from the womb, as constituting a depraved nature, which God has nevertheless not created, since it is wholly negative and not capable of creation. Such we shall see hereafter was the opinion of Turretin and others.

To this opinion Calvin gives his entire assent, declaring that to define original sin as a want of original righteousness includes "all that actually exists in it." He only adds as a caution that this idea of defect does not fully express its *energy* and *force*; that we are not to consider a nature thus destitute of righteousness as inactive or idle, but as fruitful in all kinds of evil, from its very *want* of goodness. We give the passage at length. "Wherefore those who define original sin as a want of original righteousness which ought to be in us, although they include the whole of that which is in the thing (*quoniam id totum complectuntur quod in re est*) do not express sufficiently its *energy* and *force*. For our nature is not only weak and empty, but likewise so fertile and productive of

all evil, that it cannot be idle."* Calvin therefore with these views might believe that we have that from our birth which God has not created—a negative state, flowing out however into positive transgression.

Calvin seems likewise to have had an idea that while the soul is created by God in its substance and essential attributes, its depravity is propagated by generation from parent to child. He therefore distinguishes between the soul as created by God, and as defiled with hereditary depravity. He of course believed that in respect to moral character, the descendants of Adam are not born as God has formed them, i. e. that they are by birth, what they are not by creation, to wit, sinful. "There is nothing therefore absurd" he says, "if in consequence of his (Adam's) being spoiled of his dignities, that nature be destitute and poor; if in consequence of his being polluted with sin, the whole nature be infected with the contagion. From a putrified root therefore have sprung putrid branches, which have transmitted their putrescence to remoter ramifications. For the children were so vitiated in their parent, that they became contagious to their descendants. There was in Adam such a spring of corruption that it is *transfused from parents to children in a perpetual stream*." This principle he goes on to apply in the very next sentence, to the subject in debate. "But the cause of the contagion is not in THE SUBSTANCE OF THE BODY OR THE SOUL;" in other words it is not in that which God has created,—not a physical property formed by God in the constitution of the body or the mind. Whence then does it arise? From natural generation in Calvin's view as before stated; and he then proceeds to vindicate this constitution; "because" he adds, "it was ordained by God that the gifts which he conferred on the first man, should by him be preserved or lost both for himself and all his posterity."† Professor N. may say that

* Inst. Lib. II. C. I. §. 8. † Lib. II. C. I. §. 7.

this distinction is very absurd and unphilosophical. Nevertheless it was believed in by Calvin, and therefore in his view saved him from the inference imputed by Professor Norton. As Calvin then did on two distinct grounds, believe that in respect to moral character, "we the descendants of Adam are not born as God has formed us," i. e. that we have from our birth that which is not created in us by God, Professor N. is bound to admit according to his promise, "that it is not a doctrine of Calvinism, that men are created by God with sinful natures."

Again, the language of Calvin will not bear the meaning given it by Professor Norton. For Calvin explicitly affirms that original sin comprises "*perversity of heart*," and also personal "*wickedness*," terms which were never used by any writer to denote any thing but voluntary states of mind, and which according to every just principle of interpretation as necessarily suppose *the moral agency* of the subject, as they do his existence. To say then that by original sin, which according to Calvin consists in that which can be predicated only of moral agents, and is itself an act of such agents, Calvin meant a created attribute or physical property, is a perversion of his language which nothing can justify. Such language, was never used by any writer of common sense, with such a meaning.

Calvin says that original sin is the hereditary depravity and corruption of our nature, and Prof. N. would have it believed, that to use the word nature in such a connexion to denote any thing which is not from God, is "atheistical."—But the nature itself may be from God, and the corruption of this nature may be from ourselves. We have good authority for this. "As Unitarians believe" says Dr. Ware, "this corrupt nature is not what they received from God but what they have made for themselves." Lett. p. 36. Calvin then might have been as philosophi-

cal in his opinions as Unitarians are, and yet have believed, that men make "their whole nature" corrupt, and that this thus becomes "a seed of sin" even in infancy. We shall see hereafter that Calvin did in fact believe that the corruption of man's nature was the corruption of God's work by man, and not itself the work of God.

The clause that "we are born with sin, as serpents bring their poison with them from the womb," is one on which Prof. N. places his chief reliance. This figurative mode of illustration has been not unfrequently adopted by Calvinistic writers, to denote merely that in the nature of man, there is *that* which is the occasion of the certain commencement of sin, in his first moral exercise. Prof. N. obviously supposes Calvin to assert that sin itself pertains to the nature of man in precisely the same sense in which poison pertains to the nature of a serpent; that as poison is a physical property of one, so sin is a physical property of the other. Such a meaning of the passage, (and if such be not its meaning, it is not to the purpose for which it is quoted) is authorized by no just principle of interpretation. In determining the true import of such language we are not to suppose an exact resemblance between the objects of the comparison; but are bound to look carefully at the design of the speaker or writer, and to restrict the resemblance by the acknowledged properties of the things compared. For example, who would infer from the comparisons, which occur in the sacred volume, of the wicked to serpents, that the design is to represent wickedness in men to be a physical property? So in the present case, *sin* is a predicate, the idea of which as a *moral* property is so unavoidable, that no language which can possibly admit the exclusion of the idea of a physical property, *can* be supposed to include it. This is an universal principle of interpretation in cases like the present, as the example just given decisively shews. To suppose therefore that

Calvin, when comparing *in some respects*, an acknowledged *moral* property in man, with a *physical* property of a serpent, intended to convey the idea that the former is itself a physical property is another palpable perversion of his language.

Besides, does not Calvin in the same passage and as a reply to Professor Norton's very charge, say "that there are two kinds of nature—the first was originally made by God, the second is the corruption of the former;" and does not this distinction clearly imply that the second, or the corruption of nature is *not* made by God?

Where then is the assertion in this passage or in any of the passages cited by Professor N. from Calvin, that God creates men with a sinful nature? There is none. Professor N. has specified none. To support his position with any degree of plausibility, he is obliged to resort to assumption and inference. Thus, as we have seen, he says "if it can be proved to be a doctrine of Calvinism," &c. And if Professor N. will argue and infer, why does *he* not *prove* what is necessary to support his inference; why does he not prove (as his assumed position, to give it any shew of argument, should have been stated,) that Calvin believed that whatever we are at our birth, we are by creation? Thus the amount of proof adduced by Professor N. in support of his charge against Calvin is this; from Calvin's assertion that "we are born with sin," and from Professor Norton's assumption that whatever we are at our birth we are by creation, he *INFERS*, that it is Calvin's doctrine, that *God creates men with a sinful nature*. This Professor N. has done, while he has also acknowledged the injustice of imputing to any man, the unavowed, though legitimate consequences of his opinions.* Nor is this all. The

inference, the belief of which is ascribed to Calvin, is founded on the assumption of an axiom, which (whether right or wrong,) Calvin totally disclaimed. It is therefore an inference which Calvin could not have made nor have believed, according to his own avowed principles. On what authority then, is Professor Norton's *inference* to be acknowledged as a part of Calvin's creed?

We next consider the passages cited by Mr. Norton from the Westminster Catechism and Confession:—

"The Fall brought mankind into an estate of sin and misery" ***** "The sinfulness of that estate whereinto men fell, consists in the guilt of Adam's first sin, the want of that righteousness wherein he was created, and the corruption of his nature, whereby he is utterly indisposed, disabled and made opposite to all that is spiritually good, and wholly inclined to all evil, and that continually, which is commonly called Original Sin, and from which do proceed all actual transgressions.—pp. 9, 10.

We again ask for the declaration that *God creates men with a sinful nature*. It is not in the phrase that "the fall brought mankind into an estate of sin and misery." The fall was not a creative act of God. Not in the phrase "the sinfulness of that estate whereinto man fell;" to fall into a state of sin is not to be created

by many, to be a legitimate inference, that God is not sincere in his invitations of mercy to a part of mankind. But who would be so disingenuous as to charge those who believe the doctrine with believing the inference? Professor N. after citing Eph. ii. 3. "we were by nature children of wrath even as others," says in a note, "the proper meaning of these words I conceive to be this: WE were by nature as much exposed to punishment as the rest of men; that is, WE Jewish christians," &c. Now it seems to be a legitimate inference from this exposition, that both Jews and Gentiles are all *BY NATURE* exposed to punishment, and that all are *BY NATURE* sinful. Shall we then pronounce Professor N. a Calvinist, according to his own account of Calvinism? We should rather suppose that this, to use his own language, "is an honest blunder without doubt, though a very gross one."

*From the doctrine of limited atonement, it would be confidently pronounced

with a sinful nature. To be guilty of Adam's sin is not to be created with a sinful nature; to want that righteousness in which Adam was created is not to be created with a sinful nature; and to say that man is the subject of the corruption of his nature is not saying that God created that corruption of nature: and to say that by this corruption ("whereby") he is utterly indisposed, disabled and made opposite to all good, &c. is not saying that this indisposition, disability and opposition are a created nature, or that they are not the result of man's free choice.

Mr. N. quotes a passage from the Westminster Confession:—

"Man by his fall into a state of sin, hath wholly lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation; so as a natural man, being altogether averse from that good, and dead in sin, is not able by his own strength to convert himself, or to prepare himself thereunto."—p. 10.

Let this passage be examined. 'Man by his fall into a state of sin.' Is this equivalent to a sinful nature created by God? "Hath wholly lost all ability of will to any spiritual good." What is it to lose ability of will but to become voluntarily opposed to spiritual good with fixed aversion? So the next clause explains it, "being altogether averse to that good." But is voluntary fixed aversion of mind to spiritual good, a *sinful nature created by God*? Can such aversion be any thing but man's own act in distinction from a physical attribute? It is remarkable that in these passages quoted by Mr. N. there is not the semblance of ascribing the sin of man to a creative act of God, but a distinct recognition of it, as being the act of man as a moral agent.

Mr. Norton has quoted several passages from President Edwards' work on original sin. It will be sufficient to examine one of these, quoted in his original letter to the Edit-

or of the Christian Spectator, as the others convey the same general truth, with great similarity of expression.

I now proceed to say,

That mankind are all naturally in such a state, as is attended, without fail, with this consequence or issue; that they universally run themselves into that which is, in effect, their own utter, eternal perdition, as being finally accursed of God, and the subjects of his remediless wrath through sin.—Vol. VI. p. 137.

We might leave this passage with simply asking the question, may not men be brought into being in such a state that *they will run themselves into sin* (and what more has Edwards asserted,) without being created with a sinful nature?

But what probably will surprise the reader still more is the fact, that on the same page from which Professor Norton has cited the above proposition of Edwards, is to be found the following clear explanation of his meaning in that proposition:—

In order to demonstrate what is asserted in the proposition laid down, there is need only that these two things should be made manifest: *One* is this fact, that all mankind come into the world in such a state, as without fail comes to this issue, namely, the universal commission of sin; or that every one who comes to act in the world *as a moral agent*, is, in a greater or less degree, guilty of sin. *The other* is, &c.

It ought here to be remarked that on this page, President Edwards is formally stating and explaining the grand positions which he proposes to establish in the following treatise; and what is the point in respect to the present subject of enquiry? Is it that God creates men with a sinful nature? So far from it, that in his own explanatory and decisive terms, it is this, that "every one who comes *to act* in the world *AS A MORAL AGENT*, is in a greater or less degree, guilty of sin." Why did Professor Norton refuse to cite this passage?

We cannot pass this part of the subject without turning the reader's attention to the precise and careful

manner in which President Edwards, in the four first sections of this work, has by statements, definitions and explanations, guarded against the identical charge of Professor Norton. Thus if he speaks of *that* in man, which is the ground or reason of his sinning, he calls it a state in which man comes into the world, leaving the specific nature of that state undecided; or if he calls it a propensity, tendency, proneness, liability, &c. he is careful to limit the import of the language to the single idea of sequence; i. e. tendency, in his use of the term, is something followed by sin. Whether this tendency, disposition, proneness, &c. be a voluntary or involuntary state of mind, whether the subject be accountable for it or not, he does not decide. The simple fact, that there is that which, as the *occasion*, will be followed by the commission of sin by every human being, when he comes to act as a moral agent, is what this author attempts to prove in his second section.

If President Edwards pronounces this an *evil, depraved* and pernicious propensity, he is careful to tell us in what sense it is evil, viz. as "*it tends to that MORAL EVIL by which the subject becomes odious in the sight of God, and liable as such to be condemned, &c.*" Thus he does not assert that this propensity is in itself sinful and deserving of punishment; but simply that it *tends* to or is followed by those moral acts, by which the subject becomes ill-deserving.* Speaking of this *tendency*, viewed without the interposition of divine grace, he proceeds to shew, that its existence is evinced by the fact, that men do sin as soon as they are capa-

ble of sinning, and that they sin continually and progressively. The views then of the depravity of man, as explained by this distinguished advocate of the doctrine, may be comprised in this general proposition:—

That mankind come into being in such a state that, without the interposition of divine grace, all, when they become moral agents, sin in every voluntary and accountable action.—We ask the reader to judge; is this the doctrine that *God creates men with a sinful nature?*

We say then, that the passages quoted by Professor N. from Calvin, from the Westminster divines and from Edwards, furnish not even the shadow of a warrant for ascribing to Calvinists the doctrine, that *God creates men with a sinful nature*. There is not such an assertion; Professor Norton has specified no such assertion, in either of the quotations which he has made. By confident asseveration, he leads the reader to expect that he can point out the doctrine which he imputes to Calvinists in the words of Calvinistic authors. He then cites passages which may mislead the prejudiced and unwary, and relies on them to draw the inference so unconsciously to themselves, that they shall believe that Calvinists have asserted what an unauthorised inference only contains. Or if this will not answer his purpose, as in some cases it will not, he boldly adds what is necessary to the premises or omits an essential explanation of terms, and draws the inference himself. Such are Professor Norton's expedients to fasten upon Calvinists the odium of holding a doctrine, which in its connexions he pronounces "*blasphemy.*"

We now proceed to shew

2. That the authors referred to explicitly *deny* the doctrine ascribed to them by Professor Norton. On this point we cited several passages from Calvin in our Number for August last. To these passages Pro-

* Dr. Ware asserts the same thing concerning the import of the term *propensity*. "In the sense in which I understand the word, the essence of sin does not consist in propensity, inclination or disposition to sin, but in yielding to that propensity, &c." Ans. p. 82, on p. 84, he speaks of propensity as implying "no guilt," until indulged unlawfully.

fessor N. replies, that "the whole amount of them is, that God is not to be charged with the sins of men as morally accountable for them;" and thus he would have it understood, that while Calvin exonerated God from blame, he still maintained that God creates men with a sinful nature. We *deny* that such is the amount of these passages. We before remarked that the *design* of Calvin was to oppose those who dare to charge God with their corruptions. But how does Calvin accomplish this design? By admitting the fact alleged; that God is, by a creative act, the author of man's corruption? So far from it that he says, "they *falsely* seek for the *work of God* in their *own* pollution." Can language be more explicit? Could Calvin believe that God created this pollution,—that it was the *work of God*? "Wherefore," he says, "let us remember that our fall must be imputed to a corruption of nature, that we may not bring an accusation against God the author of nature." Is not here a distinct recognition of the principle, that an accusation would lie against God the author of nature on the supposition that he *creates* a sinful nature? How then could he believe this fact, and yet exonerate God? Again he says, "it arises not from creation, but from the corruption of nature, that man being enslaved by sin can will nothing but what is evil." And again, "I ask what can be pleaded, seeing he cannot impute the hardness of his heart to any one but himself?" The fallacy then of Professor Norton's reply is apparent. The *design* of Calvin is to oppose those who dare to charge God with their own corruptions. The *amount* of what he says is that the charge is *false*, because their pollution is not the work of God, but their own pollution; because their corruption is not to be charged to the *author of nature*; because the hardness of man's heart can be imputed to *none* but himself; because men's being enslaved to sin is *not by crea-*

tion. Calvin then did not believe, but did expressly deny that God creates men with a sinful nature.

Professor N. makes another reply to our construction of one of the above passages, viz. "that it is not the creation of men individually, which is here spoken of by Calvin, but the creation of Adam in a pure and holy state, from which he fell." After stating the opinion of Calvin, that Adam was the representative of his posterity, Professor N. says, "this is the despicable subterfuge which is resorted to by Calvin and his followers, to vindicate the ways of God and to prove, not that God does not now create men with a sinful nature, but that it is just in him to do so, and that he is not accountable for their sins." p. 33. Now we affirm that Calvin recurs to our representation in Adam for the very purpose of proving that God does *not* now create men with a sinful nature. After speaking of all the descendants of Adam as infected with the corruption into which he had fallen, and referring to the assertion of Paul that "all are by nature children of wrath," Calvin says "It is easily inferred that *our* nature is there characterized, not as it was created by God, but as it was vitiated in Adam, because it would be unreasonable to make God the author of death.*"

In this passage Calvin declares that *our* nature is characterised by the apostle, not as *it* was created by God, but as it was vitiated in Adam, for the very purpose of shewing that God is not the *author* of this corruption. Calvin considered Adam as the representative of his descendants in such a sense, that the holy nature in which he was created was the created moral nature of man; and that in consequence of the corruption of that nature by Adam, we are the subjects of the *same* corruption. Hence he constantly affirms that "*our* nature is not as *it* was created by God;" that our corruption arises *not*

*Inst. Lib. II. C. I. §. 6.

from creation. Professor N. may ask, how can this be a just view of the subject; are not men as really created by God now, as Adam was, and if they come into the world with a corrupt nature, is not God the author of that corrupt nature? We answer, not of necessity; it may be, and Calvin, to say the least, might believe that men now are the voluntary authors of their own corruption, as Adam was of his own corruption. Be this as it may, Calvin did believe, that *our nature is not as it was created by God*; but as it was vitiated in Adam. He did believe that such was our connexion with Adam that *our* created moral nature was the created moral nature of Adam in a holy state, and that our corruption of nature, consequent on Adam's sin, is our *own* corruption, and *not the work of God*. But is there any truth or justice in such an hypothesis? Perhaps there is not. Nevertheless so Calvin believed. Is it not a mere evasion, "a despicable subterfuge?" Perhaps it is. Nevertheless so Calvin believed, and so DENIED that *God creates men with a sinful nature*.

In accordance with these views Calvin says that "the cause of the contagion as it is propagated through successive generations, is not in the substance of the body or the soul;* and that not any thing in the universe is evil in its nature, since neither the depravity and wickedness of men and devils, nor the sins which proceed from that source, are from mere nature, but from the corruption of nature."† We ask the reader's particular attention to the following passage: "We say therefore, that man is corrupted by a natural depravity, but which did not originate from nature. We deny that it proceeded from nature, to signify that it is rather an adventitious quality or accident, than a substantial property originally innate. Yet we call it natural, that no one may suppose it to be contracted by every individ-

ual from corrupt habit, whereas it prevails over all by hereditary right. Nor is this representation of ours without authority. For the same reason the apostle says, that we are all by nature the children of wrath. How could God, who is pleased with all his meanest works, be angry with the noblest of all his creatures? But he is angry rather with the corruption of his work, than with his work itself. Therefore, if on account of the corruption of human nature man may be justly said to be naturally abominable to God, he may also be truly said to be naturally depraved and corrupt; as Augustine, in consequence of the corruption of nature, hesitates not to call those sins natural which necessarily predominate in our flesh, where they are not prevented by the grace of God. Thus vanishes the foolish and nugatory system of the Manicheans, who, having imagined in man a substantial wickedness, presumed to invent for him a new creator, that they might not appear to assign the cause and origin of evil to a righteous God."* We ask how can that be a sinful nature created by God, in the view of Calvin, which according to his statement, is rather an adventitious quality or accident, than a substantial property originally innate—which is not from nature, which proceeded not from nature, which is *called* natural only in opposition to the effects of corrupt habit—which is distinguished from the work of God, as being the corruption of his work by man himself—and which stamps folly and vanity on that scheme which ascribes *substantial* wickedness to man, and undertakes to account for it by an hypothesis so totally needless as the one referred to. Calvin then fully and explicitly denies the doctrine charged upon him by Professor Norton; and by what principles of liberality or fair dealing, is Calvin to be denied the benefit of his unqualified disavowal of this doctrine?

*Inst. Lib. II. 6. 1. 4. 7. †Lib. I. 6. 14. §. 3.

*Inst. Lib. II. Ch. I. §. 11.

The Westminster divines have denied the same thing with equal explicitness. We have already quoted the passage which is as follows.

"God hath endued the will of man with that natural liberty, that it is neither forced, nor, by any absolute necessity of nature, determined to do good or evil."

On our citation of this passage, Mr. N. remarks:—

If it had been their object to show what the Westminster Divines really believed respecting the nature of man, it would have been a little more to the purpose, to have quoted the next proposition but one to that given by them.

"Man by his fall into a state of sin hath wholly lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation; so as a natural man being altogether averse from that good, and dead in sin, is not able by his own strength to convert himself, or to prepare himself thereto."

It must be an affair, I think, of some deliberation and difficulty for them to reconcile the meaning which they wish their readers to receive from the first proposition, with what is so broadly and explicitly stated in the last.—p. 39.

That Professor Norton thinks it to be an affair of difficulty to reconcile these passages, we do not deny. His insinuation however, that these passages are irreconcilable, is a virtual admission that one denies what the other affirms. That the Westminster divines then, deny that God creates men with a sinful nature, (whether consistently or inconsistently is immaterial,) is virtually conceded by Professor N. Nor do we discover any difficulty in reconciling these passages. There is no inconsistency in affirming that the will of man is endued with natural liberty, so that it is neither forced nor by any absolute necessity of nature determined to good or evil, and yet that he has fallen into sin, and that by a fixed aversion of will to any thing good, it has become impossible that he should convert himself. It is simply saying that man will not do what, as a moral agent, he is qualified to do. This being the obvious and undeniable import of the passages, we see no

difficulty in reconciling the meaning of the one with that of the other. The Westminster divines then, with perfect consistency, DENY that God creates men with a sinful nature.

The same denial is also explicitly made by President Edwards. We cite the following passages from his Discourse on Original Sin, in the sixth volume of his works:—

One argument against men's being supposed to be born with sinful depravity, which Dr. Taylor greatly insists upon, is, That this does in effect charge Him, who, is the author of our nature, who formed us in the womb, with being the author of a sinful corruption of nature; and that it is highly injurious to the God of our nature, whose hands have formed and fashioned us, to believe our nature to be originally corrupted, and that in the worst sense of corruption.

With respect to this, I would observe in the first place, that this writer, in his handling this grand objection, supposes something to belong to the doctrine objected against, as maintained by the divines whom he is opposing, which does not belong to it, nor does follow from it: As particularly, he supposes the doctrine of Original Sin to imply, that nature must be corrupted by some positive influence; "something by some means or other, infused into the human nature; some quality or other, not from the choice of our minds, but like a taint, tincture or infection, altering the natural constitution, faculties and dispositions of our souls. That sin and evil dispositions are implanted in the foetus in the womb." Whereas truly our doctrine neither implies nor infers any such thing. In order to account for a sinful corruption of nature, yea, a total native depravity of the heart of man, there is not the least need of supposing any evil quality, infused, implanted or wrought into the nature of man, by any positive cause or influence whatsoever, either from God or the creature; or of supposing, that man is conceived and born with a fountain of evil in his heart, such as is any thing positive. I think a little attention to the nature of things will be sufficient to satisfy any impartial, considerate inquirer, that the absence of positive good principles, and so the withholding of a special divine influence to impart and maintain those good principles, leaving the common natural principles of self-love, natural appetite, &c. (which were in man in innocence,) leaving these, I say, to themselves, without the government of superior divine principles, will certainly be followed with the corruption, yea, the total corruption of the heart, with-

out occasion for any positive influence at all — pp. 427, 428.

The inferior principles of self-love and natural appetite, which were given only to serve, being alone, and left to themselves, *of course*, became reigning principles; having no superior principles to regulate or control them, they became absolute masters of the heart. The immediate consequence of which was a *fatal catastrophe*, a turning of all things upside down, and the succession of a state of the most odious and dreadful confusion. Man did immediately set up *himself*, and the objects of his private affections and appetites, as supreme; and so they took the place of God. These inferior principles are like *fire* in an house; which, we say, is a good servant, but a bad master; very useful while kept in its place, but if left to take possession of the whole house, soon brings all to destruction. Man's love to his own honor, separate interest and private pleasure, which before was wholly subordinate unto love to God, and regard to his authority and glory, now disposes and impels him to pursue those objects, without regard to God's honor or law; because there is no true regard to these divine things left in him. In consequence of which, he seeks those objects as much when against God's honor and law, as when agreeable to them. And God, still continuing strictly to require supreme regard to himself, and forbidding all gratifications of these inferior passions, but only in perfect subordination to the ends, and agreeableness to the rules and limits, which his holiness, honor and law prescribe, hence immediately arises *enmity* in the heart, now wholly under the power of self-love; and nothing but *war* ensues, in a constant course, against God. As, when a subject has once renounced his lawful sovereign, and set up a pretender in his stead, a state of enmity and war against his rightful king necessarily ensues. It were easy to shew, how every lust and depraved disposition of man's heart would naturally arise from this *privative* original, if here were room for it. — p. 430.

In the above quotation, President Edwards has stated from Dr. Taylor, almost *verbatim et literatim*, the very charge against Calvinism alleged by Professor Norton; and has most unequivocally declared, that the thing alleged does NOT BELONG to the doctrine objected against, nor does FOLLOW from it; and that to suppose our doctrine to imply that nature must be corrupted by some *positive influence*, something *infused* into the human nature, some quality or other not from the *choice* of our

minds, &c. &c. is entirely groundless.

“WHEREAS TRULY OUR DOCTRINE NEITHER IMPLIES NOR INFERS ANY SUCH THING.” Can the denial of Professor Norton's charge be more unequivocal?

And yet Professor Norton says, “the doctrine of Edwards is that men, as created by God, have natures so corrupt, that it is not necessary for him to exert any positive influence to make them sinners, or to infuse into their natures any new principle of evil.” Does not Edwards assert, that the common natural principles of self-love, natural appetite &c. *which were in men in innocence*, left to themselves, without the government of superior divine principles, will certainly be *followed with* the entire corruption of the heart, without any positive influence from God at all? Does he not speak of these natural principles as in themselves sinless, yea, as useful when kept in their proper place; and does he not represent all the sin of man, every lust and depraved disposition of his heart, as resulting from man's setting up *himself*, in the character of a free and voluntary agent, and the objects of his private affections and appetites as supreme, and thus giving them the place due to God? And yet with these declarations pointed out to him, and actually under his eye, Mr. N. would attempt to make his readers believe that Edwards represents God as creating a sinful nature in man and punishing them eternally for this nature. We ask the reader's opinion, not concerning this representation of Mr. Norton, but concerning the real doctrine of Edwards, as taught in the above extract.

To these denials of the doctrine that “God creates men with a sinful nature” we added, in our Number for August last, the testimony of Dr. Ridgeley, as a representative of “later Calvinists;” and selected his work particularly, because it has been lately republished in this country, and enjoys a high reputation among the most rigid Calvinists in

the Presbyterian church. "To suppose," says he, "that it (the soul,) is created by God impure or with an inclination or propensity to sin, cannot well be reconciled with the holiness of God."* Language so explicit was beyond the reach of distortion or evasive inference. Under these trying circumstances, Professor Norton's skill in conducting the retreat is an edifying example to all future polemics. He commences with the *petitio principii*, and pronounces rather magisterially, that the passage "certainly appears to be *Anti-Calvinistic*." To cover a position thus boldly occupied, a volley of hard words naturally succeeds. "I have not taken the trouble to examine its connexion and ascertain whether this arise from *"ignorance of the proper use of language,"* or some other cause." Next follows the *argumentum ab ignorantia*, (for even Prof. N. can be ignorant on occasion,) "I do not even know whether Ridgeley himself did or did not pretend to be a Calvinist." Here the Professor is suddenly overtaken with a distressing pressure for time; "and though the question might be easily settled, *it is not worth the labor of half an hour,* that might be required to settle it." He therefore at once demolishes Ridgeley and ourselves at a single blow: "He might, for any thing I know, have been as ignorant on the subject as the conductors of the Christian Spectator are, or appear to be." Such generalship certainly deserves an ovation if not a triumph.

It is fortunate, considering the splendid exhibition of polemical talent which would otherwise have been lost, that Professor N. was so entirely unacquainted with the early habits and course of study at his own college; and that he had never heard of Ridgeley's Body of Divinity being once esteemed so highly at Cambridge, that duplicate copies were thought necessary in the library of that Institution, for the use of theological students. The very copy indeed,

*Body of Divinity, Vol. I. q. 26.

from which we made our quotation, belonged not many years since to the Library of Harvard College, and was sold at public auction in Boston, being found a useless incumbrance, we presume, in these later days of "consummate theologians." Considering all circumstances too, it is happy that Professor N. did not venture to open a work of so unpromising an aspect. Had he done so, it might have startled him to find that Ridgeley was a Calvinist of "the straitest sect"—a believer in the doctrine of limited atonement, imputation of sin and righteousness, and the kindred tenets. He would have found too, as the authority for that very statement, which he pronounces "*anti-calvinistic*," a reference to names at which it would not have been quite so easy to flout—TURRETIN and PICTET. "*Absit ut animam creari impuram dicamus, cum nihil impurum e Dei manibus prodire possit.*" "Far be it from us to maintain that the mind is *created impure*, since nothing impure can proceed from the hands of God." (Pictet Theol. Chr. Lib. v. cap. 2.) "*Licet anima sine ulla labe creetur a Deo, non creatur tamen cum justitia originali,*" &c. "Though the soul is *created* by God without any *blemish*, it is not created with original righteousness." (Turretin, Inst. Theol. Elenct. Tom. 1. Loc. 9.) Turretin then proceeds to state that "we must distinguish between the mind as pure, impure, and *not pure*." By the *pure*, is meant, he says, a holy state of mind; by the *impure*, a sinful state; and by the *not pure*, a mind which is "neither holy nor sinful, but created simply with its rational faculties, as it is supposed to be created by God since the fall," (*quæ licet nullum habeat habitum bonum, nullum tamen habet malum, sed creatur simpliciter cum facultatibus naturalibus, qualis supponitur creari a Deo post lapsum, &c.*) To this authority Ridgeley adds a passage from Du Moulin. "We are not, he says, to think that God put original sin into men's souls, for how should he pur-

ish those souls which he had himself corrupted? It is great wickedness to believe that God put into the soul an inclination to sin." In order to convince Professor N. that these statements are not peculiar to the authors cited by Ridgley, we had made an extensive collection of passages equally decisive, from writers of the Geneva school which accidentally came first to hand, viz. Peter Martyr, Zanchius, David Pareus, together with Dr. Twiss, Prolocutor of the assembly of divines at Westminster, Perkins, John Howe, Bernardhin De Moor, &c. But we omit them, both because the question has been confined to the opinion of Calvin, the Westminster Divines, and President Edwards; and because there would be no end of such quotations, since hundreds of similar passages might be selected from others. Indeed from the time of Calvin to the present hour, what writer on this subject can be found, who has not explicitly denied the doctrine that "God creates men with a sinful nature?" This is the very point to which their opponents have, from the first, been laboring to drive the defenders of Calvinism—a doctrine, which the whole world knows, a large majority of Calvinists at least, have utterly rejected, as forming no part of their system or its consequences. Are these disavowals to be unregarded, and their authors branded with insincerity and falsehood? If not, the question of their *faith*—their "*doctrine*" on this subject is settled. Their consistency may be arraigned; "unavoidable inferences" may be urged; but these inferences they do not perceive to be unavoidable, and have not therefore admitted them into their system. Every sentiment then, of integrity and honor, requires Professor N. to adhere to his own principle, and impute to Calvinists no doctrines or inferences which are thus rejected. Yet in the face of this rejection by the great body of Calvinists for more than two hundred and fifty years, does Professor N. coolly assure us that it is "a doc-

trine of Calvinism that God creates men with a sinful nature," and adds respecting Ridgley who denied it on the weightiest authority, "He might for any thing I know, have been as ignorant on the subject as the conductors of the Christian Spectator are, or appear to be!"

3. Mr. Norton's own concessions shew, that neither Calvin, nor Calvinistic writers are fairly charged with believing that *God creates men with a sinful nature*. Thus he says,

But the conductors of the Spectator produce passages from Calvin, and the Westminster Confession, and Edwards, which they would have it believed are inconsistent with this doctrine. Without any examination of these passages, I might say that perhaps they are so. It is not my business to reconcile the contradictions, or explain the absurdities of Calvinistic writers. I have never had any doubt, that such contradictions and absurdities might be found in abundance in their works. It is not my business to show, what I believe to be altogether false, that their system is consistent either with itself, or with those first principles of reason and religion, which they are sometimes compelled to recognize.—p. 31.

Professor N. then has "never had any doubt," that Calvinistic writers abundantly contradict the doctrine, that *God creates men with a sinful nature*. And why are not these instances of denial, which are so abundant, good evidence that Calvinists do not believe this doctrine?

But says Mr. N. "it is not by bringing passages, which may appear to be irreconcilable with the doctrines, I have stated, that these doctrines can be proved, not to be a part of the system." But if Calvinists as Mr. N. concedes, have abundantly denied the doctrines charged upon them, then we say, it is not by bringing passages apparently irreconcilable with such *denials* that the doctrines denied, are to be proved to be a part of their system. But says Mr. N. that these doctrines are not a part of the system can "be proved only by shewing what it is impossible for them to shew, that the authorities I have quoted, do not

fully and clearly establish my positions." We reply that Professor N. can prove these doctrines *to be* a part of the Calvinistic system, only by shewing contrary to his own concessions, that these doctrines are not abundantly denied by the same authorities. We need not repeat that Mr. N's *inferences* however "unavoidable" can have no place here. No statements or inferences can (on his own principles,) be received, except those which are admitted by Calvinists, and therefore, none certainly which are positively denied. We call on him then to retract his charge of abundant contradiction, or to admit that beyond a doubt, it is not a doctrine of Calvinism that *God creates men with a sinful nature*.

We are perfectly aware that many passages can be adduced, which, at the first view, may appear inconsistent with the denials in question. Nay we are not disposed to deny that if the principles of philosophizing adopted at the *present* day be applied to these passages, there may, in some instances, be a real inconsistency. But can any thing be more unjust than to suppose the men of the *sixteenth* century to have reasoned in every respect on the principles of the *nineteenth*, and to charge them with inconsistencies which according to *their* views of philosophy had no existence? Besides, so ambiguous is language, and so liable are men engaged in controversy to misunderstand their opponents, that the *denial* by a writer of any given meaning charged upon him, is justly considered by all reasonable men, as satisfactory evidence that such was not his real meaning. Especially is this just, when the language used does not necessarily require the meaning charged, but admits of a sense consistent with his sentiments as elsewhere stated. More especially is this demanded by candor and integrity, when the meaning charged is made out by mere *inference*—an inference rejected in form

by the writer himself as no part of his belief.

Again, why from this abundance of contradictory statements in Calvinistic writers, did not Professor Norton present some instances to his readers that they might have the whole evidence of the case fairly before them? What should we think of an interpreter of Paul's Epistle to the Romans, who to prove the antinomianism of the Apostle, should quote the 28th verse of the 3d chap. and say nothing of the 31st, or who should say what implied that the latter was an unintentional contradiction of the former? And what "Views of Calvinism" are those which are made up of passages detached from the context, and placed before the reader in entire disjunction from those accompanying explanations, and statements, and refutations, and denials, which are designed to exhibit the real belief of Calvinists. Nothing is easier than to affix a false meaning to a passage when thus detached from its proper connexion. We have already seen how essentially different is the import which Professor N. would give to a passage from President Edwards, from its real import when seen in its true connexion and viewed according to the general tenor of the treatise. And what evidence has the reader that there are not in the abundant contradictions, as Professor N. is pleased to term them, many similar explanatory passages? True, if the alleged contradictions can be shewn to be merely accidental, and unintentional, the result of inadvertence, they are not entitled to notice in this argument. But if, as we have seen, they are formal, express, intended denials of the very doctrine charged, then they can be evaded only by accusing the great body of Calvinistic writers with deliberate falsehood.

But we have not done with Prof. N's concessions. The doctrine "that God is morally accountable for the sins of men," though he thinks it may be an unavoidable inference from

the Calvinistic system, Prof. N. concedes, is "not to be found in any Calvinistic authority;" that "it is not one which Calvin admitted," that "it is the very inference against which he is contending." Why then has Prof. N. affirmed it to be a part of the Calvinistic creed? We are aware, that he says he has not. But what is the matter of fact? Prof. N. speaks of the Calvinistic system of doctrines, as "a system of blasphemy"—as "a belief," "brutalizing the whole character of him by whom it is held,"—as "DOCTRINES OF DEVILS"—and after quoting passages from Calvinistic writers he says, "But I forbear. In quoting BLASPHEMY like this, I can hardly avoid feeling, as if I shared in the guilt of uttering it." Calvinism then is *blasphemy*; it is "a belief," which *brutalizes* the whole character, it is the *doctrines of devils*; it involves *the guilt* of blasphemy; for Mr. N. is afraid of being a partaker in that guilt. But if Calvinists do not admit, that 'God is morally accountable for the sins of men,' if 'no such doctrine is to be found in any Calvinistic authority,' if 'Calvinistic writers contend against every such imputation on the character of God,' if they themselves as we have seen, revolt from making it, and 'inveigh against those who dare to bring this charge,' facts conceded by Professor Norton, where is the blasphemy of their creed, where is the brutalizing tendency of their belief; where is the doctrine of devils, and especially where is the *guilt* of blasphemy? Does Prof. N. say that it is *by inference* that they are to be thus charged with blasphemy; he violates his own principle of fair dealing. No. If they are justly charged with blasphemy, they have made some blasphemous declaration, and if they have not declared that God is morally accountable for the sins of men, what blasphemous declaration have they made? None. And as Mr. N. admits that they have not done this,—and also concedes the injustice of such an imputation by inference, in making the charge of blas-

phemy, he is condemned out of his own mouth.

4. Professor Norton misinterprets the language of Calvinistic writers. We allude to the phrases, "by nature sinners,"—"depraved by nature"—"naturally depraved," &c. as used by Calvinistic authors, in reference to the moral character of man. This language is ever represented by the opposers of Calvinism, as denoting a created sinful nature, which is as truly a physical property of man, as are any of his physical appetites and propensities. In this representation it is constantly assumed, that a sinful nature is ascribed to man by Calvinists, which is exclusively the effect of God's creative act, so that in the production of it, man can have no knowledge or concurrence. On the justness of this interpretation of Calvinistic phraseology, wholly turns the present question between Unitarians and Calvinists. If these phrases correctly interpreted, do not denote that sin in man is a physical attribute, if they *admit* and especially if they *require* a meaning consistent with complete free agency in man, then Unitarians misinterpret the language of Calvinists, and ascribe to them a doctrine which they do not teach. Precisely on this ground, Professor Norton has placed the present question.

"Thus it is," he says, "that God regards all his human creatures, in their natural state, that is, as created by him; unless indeed you choose the gross inconsistency and absurdity of putting an atheistical sense upon the words *nature* and *natural*, and supposing that *may be by nature*, and *may be natural*, which is not from God."—p. 16.

Here then we are fairly at issue with the author of "the Views of Calvinism," for we do affirm that, *that may be said to be by nature, and to be natural, which is not from God, or which is not created by God.*

In the first place we appeal to the analogy of language, in support of this position. Nothing is more common in writing and speaking, than that use of terms, in which one thing

is said to be *by* another, when the former is simply *occasioned* by the latter. It is needless to give examples of a mode of speech which so often occurs. That man may thus become a sinner, *by nature*, we have Dr. Ware's direct assertion. Speaking of that degree of wickedness which the Orthodox ascribe to men he says:—

All these representations may be true, and no more than a just account of what actually takes place, and yet the whole be fairly accounted for, without any original and natural bias to sin. All may be but the effect of neglect to restrain appetites, in themselves useful and good, to control and give a proper direction to passions designed to be useful and capable of the very best effects, and in general a failure to exercise properly, in temptations and trials, the powers of direction and resistance, which were in themselves sufficient. —pp. 23, 24.

Now on this supposition, that man, without any created *sinful* bias in his nature, (for this is what Dr. Ware means by original and natural bias to sin,) and with powers of direction and resistance sufficient to regulate his natural appetites and passions, does invariably and yet voluntarily give to *these* entire dominion over his conduct, and that the moral character of the whole race is actually thus formed, on this supposition we say, to speak of man as *a sinner by nature*, as *depraved by nature*, is language of the most obvious propriety. Such is, substantially the very explanation, as we have seen, given by President Edwards of the universal prevalence of sin in men.

Secondly, that the language in question *may have* another meaning, than that which Professor N. gives it, is inferred from the acknowledged ambiguity of language. So multiform and various are our different shades of thought, that a language which should have a distinct term for every such variation, if it could be formed, could never be learned. The only remedy for this unavoidable imperfection of human language is, to use the same words in different senses, and to rely on the nature of the subject and other circumstances, to de-

termine their precise import, in each particular case. There is perhaps no word in our language of such frequent use as the words *nature* and *natural*, which has not a diversity of meaning in different connexions. The presumption is, that the same thing is true respecting these terms.

Thirdly, we argue the same thing from common usage. Thus we speak of God "as holy by nature;" of "the holy nature of God;" of angels as "holy by nature;" and of "the holy nature of angels." We speak of pride, or vanity, or selfishness, or avarice, as *natural* to some men, and of these and other traits of character as natural to some families or even to some nations, without a suspicion, that we shall be thought to mean *a created nature*. No one supposes, that we intend by speaking of such peculiarity as *natural*, to preclude the idea of perfect freedom of choice in its subject, or to assert that it is from God by the physical operation of a physical cause, or by a creative act. We are understood to speak of such a trait of character as resulting from *that* in the constitution and circumstances of the individual, which is, not the physical cause, but merely the occasion of "the abstract certainty" of it; "which," as Dr. Ware says, "would neither affect his freedom nor accountability."—Ans. p. 93.

We admit that the words *nature* and *natural* are often applied to effects, in order to denote their certainty and uniformity as resulting from the operation of causes, to which pertains no physical power of producing other or different effects. Thus if we say that gunpowder in contact with fire, *naturally* or *by nature*, explodes; or a stone unsupported in the air, *naturally* or *by nature*, falls toward the earth; we are understood to speak of the certainty and uniformity of these phenomena as resulting from causes to which pertains no physical power in the same circumstances, of producing any other effects. But it is undeniable that certainty and uniformity pertain to other events, which take place, when in

the cause or agent, there is adequate power to opposite events. Thus we say "angels are by nature holy," without denying as in the case of the unsupported stone, adequate physical power to an opposite result. In each case, the language denotes the certainty and uniformity of the events spoken of, the idea of physical power to a different result being included in the one case, and omitted in the other. Nor does this variation in the meaning of the same terms occasion the least danger of misapprehension to a candid mind; the acknowledged properties of the subjects, determining with entire precision, the real meaning of the speaker. For example, should it be said that "serpents are by nature malignant," we should understand the language to describe either a physical property of the animal or that which results from a physical property having the influence of a physical cause, and of course as excluding moral agency. But should it be said that "devils are by nature malignant," the acknowledged moral and accountable character of the subjects, would lead us so to restrict the import of the declaration, as altogether to preclude the idea of a physical or created property.

The terms under consideration then, are capable at least of *two* meanings. They are sometimes used to denote certainty and uniformity which result from the operation of physical causes and which are inconsistent with moral agency; sometimes to denote certainty and uniformity which are *occasioned* by moral causes, and which are perfectly consistent with moral agency. But if this be so, then Prof. N. by giving another meaning than that which the words will bear, to Calvinistic phraseology, and resting his proof on this as its only possible meaning, has simply begged the question by an unauthorized interpretation of terms.

We shall now attempt to show that this language of Calvinists WILL NOT ADMIT of the meaning which Prof. N. gives it, but DEMANDS the

other meaning of which we have shown it to be capable.

First from the manner in which they have explained this language. Thus as we have seen Calvin has explicitly stated, that by "natural depravity," he means that "which did not originate from nature;" he also denies "that it proceeded from nature, to signify that it is rather an adventitious quality or accident, than a *substantial property originally innate*." Now any one can see from this passage that Calvin, was fully aware that his language might be perverted exactly in the manner in which Prof. N. has perverted it, and that his object was to prevent such perversion.

Pres. Edwards is equally explicit. Thus in the passage already cited, he speaks of the inferior principles implanted in man, as the principles of *mere human nature*, as principles which were *in man in innocence*, and it is of these he says, they *will be followed* with the corruption of the heart. Now is not here an obvious distinction between the *created* nature of man and the corruption which *follows* it; between *mere human nature* innocent in itself, and the sin of which it is the occasion.—But this is not all. Speaking of the tendency of the sensitive appetites and animal passions, which Dr. Turnbull and Dr. Taylor, suppose to account for the general wickedness of mankind, he says, "This tendency which is supposed, is altogether equivalent to a *natural propensity*. And again, in replying to the evasion that there is a tendency in the state of things from without to the event of sin, from the constitution and frame of the world, he says, "it alters not the case, as to this question;" and proceeds to shew that the *nature* of any being is to be judged of in reference to its proper condition. So that to speak of man as being "depraved by nature &c." does not according to Edwards, imply that *mere human nature*, i. e. the nature of man as man, his *created* nature, is sinful—a statement exactly accordant, as we have already seen, with the views of

Turritin, who says that the soul as "created simply with its natural faculties" is neither sinful nor holy. Now are not the terms of every author to be understood according to his own explanation of those terms? Have we not seen that Calvin and Edwards attach a very different import to the terms in question from that which Prof. Norton gives them? Have we not seen from Edwards' own explanation that he ascribes no sin to man except in the character of a moral agent, in the very statement of his doctrine; and that he denies all efficiency from God in the production of sin? His words then in all equity require a very different meaning from that which Prof. N. has given them.

Secondly, the nature of the case is still more decisive. The moral agency of man is recognized as a fundamental truth by all writers on morals and religion. It is one of those truths, which is evinced by every man's consciousness, and which no man can strictly disbelieve; it is a truth which the Bible everywhere assumes as one which it is wholly unnecessary formally to declare. It is therefore a truth to be assumed in all our explanations of terms to the utmost limits of possibility, and in reference to which all language which can bear the restriction, is to be restricted in its import so as not to deny it even by implication. In such a case, a proposition which predicates moral character of any being, as necessarily implies his moral agency, as it does his existence. Nor is it a truth less universally received that to suppose moral character to consist in a physical attribute, or in a created sinful nature, is a self-contradiction and absurdity. Why for example does the honest interpreter restrict the proposition, that "angels are holy by nature," so as to recognize their moral agency and exclude the idea of moral character as a physical attribute? The answer is because the very predicate in the proposition implies that they are moral agents; and because it would involve the most pal-

pable absurdity to suppose that moral character is a physical attribute of any being; an absurdity to be ascribed to no one of ordinary intelligence, so long as his language can bear another meaning. But if the subject require such restriction in one case, it does in another. If to represent the phrase *by nature*, when applied to angels as denying their moral agency, and ascribing to them moral character as a physical attribute would be a gross perversion of language, then to represent it as having this meaning when applied to man, is a perversion equally gross. Each proposition is used by those who are known to believe in the moral agency of the subject. Each proposition predicates moral character and therefore implies moral agency, to the exclusion of moral character as a physical attribute. And if a holy moral character may be predicated in this language of a confessed moral agent, so also may be a sinful moral character.

Finally, our present position is supported by principles of interpretation which have the sanction of Unitarian authority. They are thus stated by the Reviewer* of Stuart's Letters in the Christian Disciple for 1819.

The art of interpretation derives its origin from the *intrinsic ambiguity of language*. What we mean to express by this term, is the fact, that a very large proportion of sentences, *considered in themselves, merely in respect to the words of which they are composed*, are capable of expressing not one meaning only, but two or more different meanings.—p. 405.

It first teaches us to perceive the different meanings which any sentence may be used to express, as the different words of which it is composed are taken respectively in one sense or another; as it is understood literally, or figuratively; strictly and to the letter, or popularly and in a modified sense; as the language of emotion, or as a calm and unimpassioned expression of thoughts and sentiment; and it then teaches us, which is its ultimate purpose, to distinguish among *possible meanings*, the *actual meaning* of the sentence or that meaning which, in the particular case we

* Supposed to be Prof. Norton.

are considering, was intended by the author. And in what manner does it enable us to do this? Here again a full and particular answer to this question is not to be comprised in the compass of a few pages. The general answer is, that it enables us to do this *by directing our attention to all those considerations which may render it probable, that one meaning was intended by the writer rather than another.*

Some of these considerations are, the character of the writer, his habits of thinking and feeling, his common style of expression, his settled opinions and belief, the extent of his knowledge, the general state of things in which he lived, the particular local and temporary circumstances present to his mind while writing, the character and condition of those for whom he wrote, the opinions of others to which he had reference, the connexion of the sentence, or the train of thought by which it is preceded and followed, and, finally, the manner in which he was understood by those for whom he wrote, a consideration, the importance of which varies with circumstances.—pp. 408, 409.

Let us direct our attention to some of "these considerations," as they apply to the interpretation of the language of Pres. Edwards.

The first consideration is "*the character of the writer.*" We know not what may be Prof. N.'s opinion of the character of President Edwards; but we are confident that every one who has any competent knowledge of the subject will justify the assertion, that the character of this eminent servant of God furnishes the most decisive proof that the charge against him, made by Professor Norton, of teaching "a system of blasphemy," and "doctrines of devils," is false.

"His habits of thinking and feeling." Few men have entertained more enlarged views of the evil of sin, or exhibited more profound contrition for their own sins, or more powerfully portrayed the justice of God in the damnation of sinners, than President Edwards. His habits of thought and feeling then, instead of rendering it probable that he believed doctrines which imply exemption from guilt in men, or injustice in God in their condemnation, furnish evidence to support only the contra-

ry conclusion. What is there to be compared with this evidence in the present case, furnished by any Unitarian author?

"His common style of expression." We have shewn, that the language of Edwards, is in exact accordance with common usage; that from all analogous cases, the meaning given by Professor Norton in the present case, is always excluded, by just interpretation; and that the very statements of Edwards are guarded abundantly, by explanations and definitions, and even by explicit denials, designed to exclude the very meaning which Professor N. has given to his language.

"His settled opinions and belief." How could President Edwards furnish evidence of his belief that men sin as moral agents, if not by stating his belief on the subject to be "that every one who comes to act in the world AS A MORAL AGENT, is in a greater or less degree, guilty of sin?" How could he evince his disbelief, that *God creates men with a sinful nature*, if not by the unqualified declarations that "our doctrine neither implies nor infers any such thing;" that such a charge supposes "something to belong to the doctrine objected against, which does *not* belong to it, nor does *follow* from it?" If such declarations, made in such circumstances are not evidence of a man's settled opinions and belief, we could wish Professor N. to say what is.

"The extent of his knowledge."—It will not be pretended that the identical charge brought by Professor N. against Calvinism, was not made by Dr. Taylor and others; that it was not formally stated and answered by Edwards, nor of course that he was *ignorant* of the doctrine charged upon him by his opponents. It will not be said that this author did not so understand the arts of controversy and the use of language, as to enable him to exempt his statements from all just liability to the doctrine charged by his opponents. Nor will it be asserted after the evidence already

adduced on the point, that Edwards was ignorant of the absurdity of supposing moral character to be a physical attribute, or that moral character can be separated from moral agency. Such intellectual weakness will not be ascribed to this writer. He could not then have believed or taught the doctrine ascribed to him, by Mr. Norton, through the limited extent of his knowledge.

"The particular local and temporary circumstances, present to his mind while writing." We have seen that some such circumstances were actually present to the mind of Edwards when writing his treatise on Original Sin. That he was fully apprised that the Calvinistic doctrine had been misrepresented by its opposers, in the very manner in which Professor N. misrepresents it, and that he was convinced of the necessity of guarding his language against such perversion, and that he designed to guard it against such perversion, is fully evinced, by an unambiguous statement of his doctrine, by subsequent explanations, and by contradictions of the meaning charged, in terms as unequivocal as language can furnish.

"The connexion of the sentence, or the train of thought by which it is preceded and followed." We have already shewn, that 'the sentence' on which Professor N. chiefly rests his charge against President Edwards, *in its connexion*, unequivocally denies the charge alleged by Professor Norton.—The train of thought also by which the sentence is followed, is exhibited with the same designed caution in statement, for the obvious purpose of preventing the misrepresentation which the writer anticipated. These facts we think have appeared too plainly to be denied.

"Finally, the manner in which he was understood by those for whom he wrote." That any who can claim the character of skilful and impartial interpreters have understood President Edwards to teach, that *God creates men with a sinful nature*, cannot be proved. 'That the

great body of common Christians, who bear the name of Calvinists in New England, have not understood that to be Calvinism which Mr. N. says is the Calvinism of Edwards, we understand Mr. N. fully to assert. p. 23. But if that part of the community have not such views of Calvinism, it is reasonable to suppose that ministers have not; and if those who have the highest respect for the writings of Edwards, who are best acquainted with them, and who are therefore the most competent judges of their import, do not understand this author to teach the doctrines ascribed to him by Professor N., the probability is that he has not taught these doctrines.

Thus every consideration, specified by Professor N. which may render it probable that one meaning was intended by a writer rather than another, so far as it has any bearing on the present case, decisively proves that the language of Edwards, has not the meaning which Professor N. gives it, but *requires* a very different meaning.

5. The doctrine ascribed to Calvinists by Professor N. is not maintained by Calvinists *as a class*, and therefore is not properly *Calvinism*. Regarding it as a point of high importance to settle the question, "what is Calvinism," we of course attach equal importance to the mode by which the specific articles of this system are to be designated. Terms, selected for the purpose of describing the almost ever varying creeds of human formation, become peculiarly vague and indeterminate. Even the term *Christianity* if its precise import were to be settled by the adopted faith of its professed disciples, would be far from conveying definite conceptions of one complete and harmonious system of belief. It can be told what it is, only by saying what it is not, in opposition to infidel and heretical opinions; and by stating some of its more prominent and general doctrines, in which its disagreeing disciples would agree. The same remarks apply to all the subor-

dinate divisions of Christians, as they are classed according to their diversity of faith. Thus, Arminianism, Unitarianism, Calvinism, &c. are terms adopted to designate systems of faith differing from one another in some prominent and general doctrines; while the individuals embracing each system differ so widely among themselves, that they cannot be classed together on the ground of an *exact* and *minute* accordance in matters of faith, but solely on the ground of their agreement in those general doctrines, which distinguished one class from another.

Every one acquainted with the history of religious opinions, knows that almost every general doctrine considered as the peculiarity of a sect, is capable of a diversity of statement, concerning which there would be an almost equal diversity of opinion, even among those who should agree in the general doctrine itself. For example, were the grand peculiarity of Unitarianism to be stated by a simple humanitarian, in a manner that should fully express his own belief concerning the character of Christ, it would differ materially from a similar statement from a high Arian; and yet to the general doctrine, that Christ is not God, each would fully subscribe. It is unnecessary to say how unjust it would be to represent every Unitarian as being a mere humanitarian.—So among Calvinists, there are minute differences of opinion. They entertain, for example, different views of the *mode* of the Holy Spirit's operation on the heart in regeneration, and yet entirely agree in the general fact of his agency, in producing this moral transformation. A similar remark applies to the different and more specific statements of the doctrine of human depravity, by different individuals of the Calvinistic denomination. It needs no concealment, that some diversity of opinion has prevailed among this class of Christians respecting the mode of accounting for the general fact, maintained in the doc-

trine of human depravity. Amid this diversity of opinion, there is however a substantial and an obvious agreement in the general doctrine itself, as we have already stated this doctrine. All who take the denomination of Calvinists, will agree that,

Mankind come into the world in such a state, that without the interposition of divine grace, all as soon as they become moral agents, sin in every accountable act.

No one who should admit this statement, would be rejected from the Calvinistic community by his brethren on the ground of heterodoxy on this point; and every one who should admit it, would be ranked in this community by Unitarians, as differing too much from them to be admitted into their fraternity. At the same time were this proposition to include any thing more specific respecting the origin of sin than it does, many among Calvinists would not subscribe to it; and the same would be true, were less comprised in the proposition. The general truth thus stated, is regarded by the whole class as an essential truth of christianity; any thing beyond it, as a point of speculative philosophy, which may be believed or disbelieved, without affecting the real doctrine of Calvinism. It is on this ground that Calvinists consent to be classed together as a sect, believing in the doctrine of human depravity. This is the doctrine and the *only* doctrine, which they *as a class* maintain on this subject, and is therefore the doctrine and the only doctrine, which on this subject is to be called Calvinism. On the subordinate points, which respect the *mode* of accounting for the general fact, that men will sin, there is as real a diversity of opinion among the Orthodox themselves, as between them and Unitarians, respecting the fact itself. The truth is, that any one of the theories concerning the *origin* of human depravity now alluded to, may be correct or erroneous, and yet the general doctrine in which

Calvinists *as a class* agree, may be true and capable of complete vindication.

The propriety of these remarks, and the utter failure of Unitarians to meet the true doctrine of Calvinists as a class, will be seen if we consider some of the different opinions of the latter, and the course of controversy adopted by the former.

First; Some Calvinists have supposed, that the doctrine of human depravity, includes the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity. But it is well known, or if not, Unitarian writers have no apology for not knowing, that most Calvinistic divines, not to say all in New-England, have long since, rejected this tenet. To represent it then as a part of Calvinism, and to expose its absurdity, is doing nothing toward disproving any real doctrine of Calvinism.

Secondly; others of the Calvinistic school *may have* maintained, that the depravity of man originally consists in some physical attribute, some *taste* or *bias* or *propensity* or disposition to sin, which is not from the choice of the mind nor an act of choice, but which as a physical property, has the influence of a physical cause, and yet possesses a moral quality and justly exposes to punishment.—We mention this hypothesis as one which *may have* been adopted by some Calvinistic writers of eminence, not because we suppose this to be the fact, but because it is constantly ascribed to Calvinists by Unitarians.

Thirdly; others conceiving that insuperable philosophical, and scriptural objections lie against the above hypothesis, still maintain the general doctrine of depravity, but ascribe to the depravity of man a very different nature, and account for its existence in a very different manner. They suppose the depravity itself to consist in a voluntary exercise of mind, that men become moral and accountable agents at the commencement of their being, and that the ground of the certainty that

all will sin, is the efficiency of God, exerted in a way consistent with man's free agency and according to a constitution appointed by infinite wisdom.

Fourthly; another class of Calvinists, who have maintained the general doctrine of depravity, have supposed it to describe that state or constitution of man, which is the *ground*, or *occasion* of voluntary sinful exercises, and have accounted for the certainty and universality of sin in man, just as Dr. Ware accounts for *any* act of sin, viz: through the influence of the natural appetites, and passions of men, and the circumstances in which they are placed; ascribing to man perfect free agency, and to his natural appetites and passions, no moral quality in themselves, or as they exist previous to voluntary exercise.

Nearly allied to this, is another hypothesis, viz: that such are the natural appetites and passions of man, and such his circumstances, that before the period of moral and accountable agency, these occasion a commanding purpose of self-gratification, in the mind; so that when God and duty are made known, man refuses, and will certainly refuse, in the exercise of perfect free-agency, to subject the gratification of his appetites to the will of God, and is ready to oppose God, in his rightful demands as his enemy.—According to the two last theories, the depravity of man is considered rather as a state than a character, and as a depraved state since it implies, the certain destitution of that moral character which pertained to man in primitive rectitude; and becomes the occasion of the certain commission of sin, whenever man's accountable character commences. Thus man is spoken of as a sinner, before accountable action, not in the same sense but in an analogous sense to that in which we speak of men as moral beings before moral action, or as rational or social beings before rational or social exercises or acts; viz: as a being of such a constitution, and

placed in such circumstances that, as a complete moral agent, he will certainly be a sinner.

Other *modes* of accounting for the depravity of man, and of explaining its specific nature may have been adopted by others among Calvinists, or these may have been adopted under some different modifications. But whether any one of these theories be true or false is wholly immaterial in respect to the real question in debate between Calvinists and Unitarians. These are points which if discussed at all are to be discussed by Calvinists themselves; and respecting which they may all be wrong and yet be Calvinists. It belongs to them therefore, to settle the question without Unitarian interference. Any attack on this ground whether successful or unsuccessful leaves Calvinism precisely where it finds it; as really not Unitarianism, as really opposed to it, and differing from it *e toto cælo*, as were nothing done. Thus it may be true, that Adam's sin is not imputed to his posterity, and it may also be true as Calvinists maintain, that man comes into being in such a state, that he will sin and only sin in every moral act, as soon as he is capable of sinning. It may be true that the ground, or reason of this fact, is not any physical bias or propensity to sin, having the nature and influence of a physical cause; or that it is not the direct efficiency of God, or that it is not the natural appetites, &c., which Dr. Ware supposes to be the occasion of sin whenever it exists; or that is not that purpose of self-gratification which exists previous to accountable agency; we say it may be, that neither of these is the true reason of the fact, that all will sin as soon as they are able to sin, and yet such may be THE FACT itself. That the tide ebbs and flows is a *fact*, whether the theory of Newton or of St. Pierre be true, or whether both theories and twenty others be false. Now not the *mode* of accounting for the fact, or for the certainty of the fact, but *the fact* itself is the doctrine of

Calvinism. But such is not the doctrine which Unitarians ascribe to the Orthodox and against which they direct their arguments and objections. The doctrine which they oppose as the doctrine of Calvinism is at most a particular *theory*, adopted by some Calvinists, to account for the great doctrine of Calvinism, *that all will sin*; a *theory* which ascribes to man a *moral depravity, of the nature of a physical attribute, and having the influence of a physical cause*. Between this theory, and the fact for which it is designed to account, there is the same obvious distinction which there is between the theory of tides and the phenomenon itself; and it is no more true that all who believe in the fact in the former case, believe in the particular theory adopted for its explanation, than it is that all who believe in the ebbing and flowing of the tide believe this phenomenon to be owing to the currents and whirlpools of the ocean. And what should we think of the philosopher who should soberly set himself to prove, that the waters of the sea never rise and fall, because the fact is not satisfactorily accounted for, by this theory of currents and whirlpools?

Calvinism then, on the article of human depravity is not, of course, to be identified with every thing believed and taught by Calvin, or by any Calvinistic author. The reason is obvious and substantial; neither Calvin, nor any Calvinistic author is implicitly followed on this article of faith, by all who are denominated Calvinists. This, the opposers of Calvinism, will not venture to deny. What Calvinism is, then, is to be determined, not by those minute points of explanation and hypothesis, which are subjects of difference among Calvinists themselves, but by those general doctrines, in which as a class they agree. If, for example Calvinists as a class reject, or if a considerable portion of them reject any of the opinions of Calvin, then their Calvinism and the Calvinism of Calvin are unlike. And there is neither

equity nor truth, in charging them, through the mere plausibility of a name, with opinions which they reject.

We are aware that this acknowledged diversity of opinion may furnish an occasion for the reproachful insinuations of Unitarians, that there is no way except that which we now censure, of determining what Calvinism is. Without saying with what an ill grace such insinuations are made by those whose creed is so subject to change, that in some of its most distinguished abettors it ultimately becomes the belief of nothing; we reply, by asking how shall we determine what Unitarianism is?—Shall we take the opinion of the Saviour's character, maintained by Arius, or Socinus, or Priestley, or Channing, as the true criterion? Would Mr. N. be satisfied to be pronounced a Unitarian as identified in opinion with either? or would Dr. Channing be satisfied to have his Unitarianism judged of by that of Mr. Belsham, or of Mr. Norton? The answer would be, let Unitarianism be judged of, by those points of faith in which Unitarians agree; and since in respect to the distinguishing feature of Unitarianism they agree in nothing, but in the opinion that Jehovah is one God, to the exclusion of the Divinity of the Son and the Spirit, let this be the test of Unitarianism. So if Calvin, and the Westminster divines, and Edwards, and Hopkins, and Smalley, and Dwight, and Emmons, differ in the minute explanations of the doctrine of depravity, still they agree in the general doctrine itself,—that all men though complete moral agents do, unless divine grace intervene, commit sin in their first and in every subsequent moral act. Let *this* then be their Calvinism on this point; and thus the pretended difficulty vanishes.

What Calvin believed and taught, and what any modern Calvinistic authors have taught, are questions of no real importance in the present discussion, any farther than their opinions

are proved to be prevalent, in our own times and in our own country. If therefore the Professor of Sacred Literature in Cambridge University thinks it an object worthy of his zeal and labour, to collect and expose the opinions of other centuries, or even the individual opinions of some in our own age, let him have the candour frankly to acquaint the public with his design. But such is not his object. It is the Calvinism of this age, and of this country against which his attack is directed; and the mode adopted is to represent *that* to be the Calvinism of this age and of this country which is *not*. Calvinism as used by Professor N. is a term understood, and which he intends should be understood, to denote a system of religious faith, which extensively prevails in this country. And then to decide what this system of faith is, we are directed to the opinions of Calvin, of the Westminster divines, and of Edwards. True it is, if we were directed to the general tenour of their doctrines as evidence in point, we should not object. Nor indeed do we object to this appeal to these authorities on the present question, with our interpretation of their language. But we say that to appeal to these authorities with that interpretation of their language which Professor N. gives it, even allowing that interpretation to be correct, as deciding the nature of Calvinism, is to make a false exhibition of the subject. In whatever veneration these authors may be held by Calvinists in this country, whatever may be the accordance between the general tenour of their faith, and that of modern Calvinists, Professor N. has produced no evidence, he can produce none, that the Calvinism, which *he* ascribes to these authors, is the Calvinism of this country. There is not only no evidence of this fact, but decisive evidence to the contrary. On the one hand, there is no such subscription to their articles of faith by Calvinistic ministers or churches, no such use of their works

in our schools of divinity, no such recognition of their authority in matters of faith, in any form, as even to imply the accordance in belief which Professor Norton assumes. There has on the contrary been the utmost freedom of religious discussion and great diversity of opinion respecting the point under consideration, among Calvinists themselves; the theory charged upon them by Professor Norton, has been denied by them from the pulpit, and from the press again and again, and especially by controversial writers when called to contest the point, from the time of Edwards to the present; and in the recent controversy, the complaint has been almost universal, we believe, among Calvinists, that their creed has been assailed only by misrepresentation. What then if some Calvinistic writers of distinction, (we are now arguing only on supposition) have believed and taught that "God creates men with a sinful nature," where is the proof that this is an article of Calvinism in the true import of the term? Especially, where is the proof, that this, is an article of faith adopted by any living Calvinist in New-England? The creed of dead men, we leave Unitarians to adjust and controvert as they please.

We think we shall not be understood by these remarks, to intimate a belief that Calvinism has undergone any *substantial* change on the article of human depravity since the days of Calvin. All that we now assert is that, on the supposition that Mr. Norton and other Unitarian writers, rightly interpret the language of former Calvinists, on the present subject, then there is a departure from their faith in the present prevailing opinion respecting the *origin* of human depravity. The hypothesis which accounts for the universal depravity of men, by ascribing to man *a sinful nature created by God*, is extensively if not universally rejected by Calvinists of this age and country. Whether the modes of ex-

plaining the fact of universal depravity now prevalent be just or unjust, is wholly immaterial; that mode which Calvinists extensively reject is not Calvinism; and Mr. N. in representing it to be Calvinism, in the sense in which he uses the word, is fairly convicted of misrepresentation.

That Calvinists should have changed their views in the particular now supposed (the reader will remember that the present argument is hypothetical) would be in no respect dishonorable. It is not dishonorable in any man, or in any set of men to change their opinions for the better. Nor is the supposed change such in its nature, or degree, as to require those who are called Calvinists at the present time, to disclaim the appellation. It is only a change, if there be one, which respects the philosophical mode of accounting for the great fact, which the Calvinistic doctrine asserts. The doctrine itself, the true doctrine which is a peculiarity of Calvinism, remains the same. It is to be expected as the mode of controverting this doctrine varies, that the mode of defending it should vary; and when objections to it arise in a new form, or are made in the old form through misapprehension or perversion of language, it is to be expected that such changes should be made in the statements of the doctrine, as shall tend to exempt them from misapprehension, and exhibit the real doctrine in its true character. Insinuations of change then as implying fluctuation of religious opinions, in respect to the substantial doctrine of Calvinism, are groundless.

Nor can we conceive that Unitarians if they honestly believe that the Calvinism of other centuries was what they affirm, should have any reasonable, nor but one unreasonable objection to admit, that the Calvinism of this age is in one respect greatly improved. At any rate if it be a fact, that Calvinists of this age and of this country as a class

do not believe that God "creates men with a sinful nature," it ought to be formally recognized instead of being denied by Unitarians in their representations of Calvinism. And as to the fact that Unitarians by such an admission, would be obliged to contend with dead men, or to relinquish all the substantial arguments by which they would overturn the prevailing system of Calvinism, and at least to direct their assault against it, in its true and invulnerable attitude, this would be a very unreasonable pretext for resorting to misrepresentation. They may indeed prefer to keep in their hands, the weapons of attack thus furnished, they may choose to identify prevailing Calvinism with what as they pretend, was the Calvinism of other days; or with the opinions of some individual Calvinists of the present day; they may thus dupe themselves and a credulous portion of the community into the belief that such skirmishing is a decisive conflict with the real enemy, and that victory on this ground involves the surrender of the very citadel of Calvinism. But we protest against such a mode of religious warfare. It rests on the groundless assumption, that the Calvinism which they oppose, (if it ever existed,) is the Calvinism of the present age and of this country. We then call on Unitarians to shew that they justly represent Calvinism on the present article, as believed by Calvinists considered as a class; or to admit that their controversy is with the Calvinism of a former age, or at most with some few individuals of the present, while with prevailing Calvinism they have no controversy. Until they do one or the other, they are chargeable with palpable misrepresentation, and have no claim to any other reply till they can come to the contest with more candour or more information.

We have now finished what we proposed on one of the principal topics of the Unitarian controversy. It was our design to have examined

another subject of similar importance, the doctrine of moral necessity, in its connexion with moral agency. If however, on the present question, we have shewn that the opposers of Calvinism are in error, we have also effectually refuted their objections to the doctrine of depravity derived from moral necessity. For if it be a doctrine of Calvinism that men sin as moral agents, it is *not* a doctrine of Calvinism that men are subject to a necessity which destroys moral agency.

We shall now make a few remarks on the manner in which Professor N. treats the subject of the future eternal punishment of the wicked, and those who have taught this doctrine. Thus he says,

With regard to the punishment to which men are "justly liable" by nature, the imagination of Edwards, though by no means a very active faculty of his mind, absolutely revels and *runs riot* in its description.—p. 18.

After citing a passage from Edwards, the truth of which seems to us fully sustained by its scriptural allusions, Professor N. says,

The horror of this passage is in some degree aggravated, when viewed in connexion with the doctrine of the damnation of infants, and when it is recollected, that this is the description of the future state of many of those little 'vipers.'—p. 19.

Speaking of the Fifteen Sermons of Edwards he says,

The volume is darkened and discolored with the flames and smoke of Hell, represented as curling round far the greater part of the human race.—p. 20.

And again,

It may seem, as if nothing could be added to aggravate the horror and disgust which such a doctrine is adapted to produce. But it is not so. There is something, I think, more inexpressibly loathsome, in the following passage from Edwards, than in any thing I have yet quoted.—p. 20.

To the passages in which Professor N. speaks of "the effect of Ed-

ward's belief in brutalizing his whole character,"—his doctrines as "DOCTRINE OF DEVILS," taught under the insulted name of christianity; and to his charge of "BLASPHEMY" and of the *guilt of blasphemy*, upon Calvinists, we have already called our readers' attention.

Whatever violations of taste may mark the language and imagery of Edwards and of others on the subject of future punishment, this is not the ground of Professor Norton's complaint. No one can read the above cited passages, without perceiving that it is the doctrine itself of the future punishment of the wicked, which calls forth from the writer this strain of sarcasm and obloquy. Were Professor N. a believer in this doctrine, and had his object been simply to expose the false taste of the writers of a former age, he would very naturally have expressed the regret, which refined sensibility feels, when truth so awful is rendered still more revolting to the human mind, by the mode of exhibition. Piety itself may lament every deficiency of taste or of chastened expression, which tends to counteract the practical power of truth so solemn and so momentous. But the sarcasms and sneers, the imputations of *horror* and *loathsomeness* and blasphemy and "doctrines of devils" are not the dictate of mere wounded sentimentalism. In regard to the subject which prompts them, they are clear indications of unbelief, if not of settled hostility. If Professor N. believes that Edwards 'was a blasphemer of his God,' and that those who adopt the same general system of faith are partakers in the same guilt, let him adduce the proof of the fact, but why should he indulge indignant emotion, where pity and supplication are required. If he does not believe the doctrine of future eternal punishment, let him deny it, and support his denial by grave argumentation; but apart all levity and sarcasm on a theme so awful. We have known those who could treat the preacher of the divine

threatenings in a similar manner, and multiply all the epithets of "horror" and "disgust" and "blasphemy," which abound in Professor Norton's vocabulary. Let the wrath of God against sin be denounced in the very words of God, let *the fire that shall never be quenched*, and *the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone* be spoken of, and there are those who can quote this language, as characteristic of the preacher who utters it. We would hope that Professor N. is at a great remove from such men in the feelings of his heart; but let him not complain, if we express the conviction that the style in which he treats the subject of eternal punishment, tends to countenance men of this character in that hardihood of impiety which, when God denounces their damnation, throws back his words with contempt, into the very face of God.

It is with deep and melancholy regret, that we see the Professor of Sacred Literature in one of our most distinguished institutions, present himself to the public in such an attitude. There may be those who will censure us for even adverting to the fact, whose censure we should deprecate. Nor can we, convinced as we are that this doctrine is a part of that Gospel which is the power of God to salvation, relinquish it to become a theme for irreverent levity and severe reproach, as men "in whose mouth there are no reproofs." What principles of courtesy or of liberality can require us silently to acquiesce, in the steadfast hostility which thus assails the name and the memory of some of the most illustrious servants of God? What susceptibilities have their revilers of which we should be so tender, that we must yield what we regard as the cause of truth, and the reputation of its ablest defenders, to the aspersions of their enemies, without apprising the community of their mode of attack? What vindication can be offered, of that art of controversy which not only denounces opinions with the most reproachful severity, but also

converts those opinions into the most flagrant moral delinquency, in him who held them, without a pretence that his character was stained by crime or immorality?

It is, we believe, especially in those who maintain the innocence of error, enmity to some important articles of God's holy truth, that pronounces Edwards a 'blasphemer,' & his doctrines "doctrines of devils;" and we have no mask of charity to draw over it. The charity of the Son of God would not cover it; and while, as imitators of him, we would remember in our intercessions those who cherish it, we would remind them that the unrepented guilt of blackening a character of such acknowledged worth with epithets from the pit beneath, in some retributive crisis of time or eternity, may meet its reward.

There may be a standard of religious faith, which shall serve to keep Professor N. in countenance, and which may even secure applause to the boldness that stigmatizes the faith of our fathers. But the day we think is far distant when the great portion of the religious community will tolerate even with indifference, the imputations of Mr. N. on the prevailing system of religious belief in this country. Edwards, the man whose writings more than those of any other individual, have contributed to sustain the principles on which has rested the religion of New England for the last sixty years, whose labours during his life were eminently distinguished by attending power from on high, and by fruits corresponding most exactly with those which marked the labours of Apostles, whose religious opinions have been believed and taught by his successors to the present hour, with similar testimonies of the divine approbation, supporting the faith, animating the hopes, and purifying the hearts of multitudes living and dying; this man may be given up to the contempt of the descendants of those who held him in the highest veneration; he may be traduced as a deluded fanatic whose whole character was brutalized by

his opinions, and denounced as a blasphemer and a teacher of infernal dogmas; and the man who does this, may hold the chair of Sacred Literature in Harvard University; but how must he be regarded by the glorified spirit of the object of his abuse; and by those kindred spirits, who with their benefactions endowed that seat of learning, and in their prayers devoted it to the propagation of that system of faith which is thus derided and abhorred!

To conclude, we have attempted to present our readers with a plain article on a subject which lies at the foundation of the discussion between Unitarians and Calvinists. 'In this restless and fiery region of controversy,' we have aimed to maintain a spirit of kindness, and to mingle with it that faithful and sincere love to the truth which the cause demands. We shall be satisfied if we contribute to correct those misrepresentations, which we regard as the occasion of protracted contest between the parties, by shewing what Calvinism is, on the article of human depravity. From Professor Norton we expect to hear again; we hope he will appear before the public with a milder spirit. We can indeed bear the reproach of that intellectual and moral degradation, which he may think proper to award us, but it is not honourable to himself, to indulge the feelings of personal altercation. We persuade ourselves that we have none of them. We have hopes, doubtless in common with himself, extending to a future, happier state of being. Let us not then descend to breathe the sultry atmosphere, and to cherish the earth-born feelings of angry controversy; but while we contend earnestly for the truth, let us do it with that spirit of love, which shall prepare us for that brighter world of our hopes,

Where error has no place;
That creeping pestilence is driven away.
The breath of heaven has chased it. In the
heart,
No passion touches a discordant string,
But all is harmony and love.

Literary and Philosophical Intelligence.

Glow worms.—From some experiments of Mr. Macaire on glow worms, the following were the results. Solar light seems to have a constant influence on these insects. Some of them were put into boxes from which the light was excluded; and when the boxes were opened in the evening, they rarely gave any light. But the same worms in the same boxes, with glass tops and placed in the sunshine, shone brilliantly in the ensuing evening. Warmth caused them to become luminous, when thrown into water at 122 deg. they died instantly; but the light continued brilliant. At 30 deg. higher, the light was extinguished, and could not be restored. Cold destroys their luminousness. The luminous matter is a yellowish-white organized substance, chiefly albumen, on the last three rings. This substance becomes opaque by drying, and then ceases to shine. Preserved in water it shines with a yellowish-green light for two or three hours. Heat and galvanism reproduce the light as long as the substance is not opaque. It shines more in oxygen, than other gasses. All substances capable of coagulating albumen, destroy its phosphorescence. The light does not appear except in gasses containing oxygen. The galvanic pile excites it—common electricity does not.

Chemical.—A mode of rendering wood, linen &c. incombustible, has been discovered by Mr. B. Cook of Birmingham. It is effected by immersing the substances in a solution of pure vegetable alkali.

The workmen of a cotton manufactory near Dieppe, were affected with nausea, vertigo, and convulsions, and some even imagined that they saw spectres flying at them and seizing them by the throat. A thousand superstitious ceremonies were performed without effect to release them from the spell. It was at length discovered to be caused by the gaseous oxide of carbon, generated by the decomposition of oil, placed on a cast-iron stove. On account of the rarity of the air, the workmen in the upper part of the building were most affected.

A gentleman of Greensburg, (Pa.) has been boring for salt water, for more than five years, on Bush Creek, about four miles from the village. On the 17th day of January while at work, his auger suddenly sunk several inches, and the water rushed up with great force and noise. It was accompanied with a large quantity of inflammable air, supposed to be hydrogen gas. A cabin had been erected over the well for protection against the weather, in which was a small fire. The gas as it rose took fire, instantly enveloped the building in flames, and burned three men severely before they could escape. The gas continued to burn on the surface of the water with a bright and lambent flame, until the 21st, when it was extinguished by placing boards over the well covered with earth. The perforation was made to the depth of four hundred and eighty five, or ninety feet, and it is believed that a fine vein of salt water, has at length been found.

Curiosity.—There was lately placed in a Museum at Baltimore, a part of the stump of a Cypress, whose circumference was 38 feet. This, with many others, was exposed to view by the washings of the Rappahannock, at the depth of 48 feet below the surface of the earth.

The Missouri is no longer considered as a tributary stream, but is itself a mighty and principal river. It pours into the common channel four times as much water as the Mississippi, and is twice as long. The whole length of this river, from its sources among the Rocky Mountains to its outlet in the Gulf of Mexico, is between 4,000, and 5,000 miles. There is no river in the world which equals this in extent, unless perhaps it be the Niger.

In November last, a stone was found in Pompey, N. Y. having an inscription with the date 1520—6th of Leo X—the figure of a tree and serpent climbing it, and some other characters. This date is one year previous to the settlement of Quebec, a century before the Pilgrims arrived at Plymouth,

and but twenty eight years after the discovery of the Continent by Columbus.

Geography of Plants.—The subject of the original localities of plants, and the regions to which they have been transported, is one of the most precious documents, for tracing the descent, affinity and emigration of ancient nations. Among many of these nations, writing of any kind was wholly unknown. Yet many of the nutritious vegetables, grain, roots, &c. have undergone migration with the human tribes. Of many we know the native soil, and the period of their removal to others. On any extension of facts of this kind, M. de Humboldt has founded the most ingenious, historical conclusions.

The annual produce of grain, throughout Great Britain, is estimated at 400,000,000 of bushels.

A machine has been invented, in which the moving power is hydrogen gas. It depends on the general principle, that a mixture of two parts, of hydrogen with five parts of atmospheric air, on being exploded, will expand to three times its former bulk, and then instantly collapse to one sixth of the original volume.

The sect of Shakers originated in Lancashire, Eng. in 1747 from an expiring remnant of Quakers. Among those who appear to have been most conspicuous in building up this sect, was one Anne Lee, whom they called "the mother," but who called herself "the word." Attended by a number of her adherents, in 1774 she embarked for this country. After laboring two years in N. York and its vicinity for a sustenance, they were joined by the remainder of their sect who came over with their effects, and passing up the Hudson, they all settled in the vale of Watervleit, "eight measured miles" N. west of the centre of Albany. From that place there have been repeated emigrations; and the number of Shaker villages is now at least fourteen. Each village contains from two to six hundred persons, and their whole pop. is about 6000. Their property is estimated at \$800,000.

A whaling expedition is now fitting out at Cincinnati, Ohio.

Transylvania University in Ken-

tucky, has 15 Instructors, 44 Law Students, 170 Medical Students, 121 Undergraduates, 51 in preparatory studies. Total of students 386. These students are from sixteen different states. The spot on which this University stands was a complete wilderness half a century since.

The number of Light Houses in the United States is 85; which annually consume about 33,969 gallons of oil.

Sir John Sinclair has lately published a very accurate statistical view of Scotland. The following are some of the most important results:—

Extent.—The main land, including the adjacent islands, contains 30,238 square miles.

Climate.—On the east coast, 135 days of rain or snow and 230 fair. On the west coast, 205 of rain or snow, and 160 fair.

Mountains.—The highest is Bennevis, 4,370 feet. Highest inhabited place Lead-hills, 1,564 feet.

Lakes.—Largest is Loch Lomond, 45 miles square.

Rivers.—The Tay is the largest.

Cultivation.—Acres fully or partially cultivated, 5,043,450. Uncultivated, including woods, &c. 13,900,550. Total, 18,944,000.

Produce of land, (of which

£11,143,175 is the produce	<i>s</i>	<i>d</i>
of live-stock,) £23,261,155	10	0
Do. of Minerals,	1,597,653	6 8
Do. of Fisheries,	1,300,000	0 0

Total, £26,158,808 16 8

Do. of Manufactories, £14,189,486.

Commerce.—Ships 2,708; tonnage 231,273; seamen 16,300.

Paupers.—Number of parochial poor 36,000.

Population.—1,804,824, or about 60 persons to a square mile.

Revenue.—Net revenue £4,204,097.

Religion.—Synods 16; Presbyteries 78; parishes 893; established clergy 938. Members of the established church 1,407,524; others of Presbyterian principles 256,000; Baptists, &c. 50,000; Methodists 9,000; Church of England 4,000; Quakers 300.

Edinburgh University.—The matriculation list of this Seminary contains 1973 students.

The expenses of the Pension List in this country, for the four last years, amount to \$6,219,114 67.

List of New Publications.

RELIGIOUS.

Selections from the Diary and writings of Mrs. Almira Torrey, wife of Rev. Joseph Torrey, who died at Hanson, Feb. 14, 1822. To which is added, A Sermon, delivered at her funeral, by Rev. J. Butler.

A Defence of Christianity, or Infidelity disarmed. Addressed, particularly to the society of deists in Pittsburgh, Penn. and generally to sceptics of every character.—By a Layman.—Pittsburgh, pp. 55.

Report of the Board of Trustees of the Society for the Support of the Gospel among the Poor in the City of New-York, for the years 1820 and 1821. New-York.—D. Fanshaw, 1822.

The Sixth Annual Report of the American Society for Colonizing the Free People of Colour of the United States. With an appendix. Washington City.—Davis and Force. March, 1823. pp. 72, 8vo.

Remarks on the Miraculous Character of our Lord. By a Berean Layman.

The New Testament, with References and a Key Sheet of questions, historical, doctrinal, and practical; designed to facilitate the acquisition of Scriptural knowledge, in Bible Classes, Sunday Schools, common Schools, and private families. By Hervey Wilbur, A. M.

A POSTSCRIPT to the second series of Letters addressed to Trinitarians and Calvinists, in reply to the remarks of Dr. Woods on those Letters. By Henry Ware, D.D. Cambridge.—Hilliard and Metcalf, 1823. pp. 48. 8vo.

An Account of the Revival of Religion in Boston in the years 1740, 1, 2 and 3, together with some account of the Rev. George Whitfield—By Thomas Prince, one of the then Pastors of the Old South Church.

Sermons on various subjects, practical and doctrinal, by Samuel Worcester, D. D. late senior pastor of the Tabernacle Church, Salem, Ms. H. Whipple, Salem. 1823. \$2.25.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Accounts of Shipwrecks, and other Disasters at Sea, designed to be interesting and useful to Mariners. With an appendix, containing Dr. Payson's Address to Seamen, and Prayers. Compiled by a Friend of Seamen.—Price \$1.

An Official Report of the trials of sundry negroes, charged with an attempt to raise an insurrection in the State of South Carolina; preceded by an introduction and Narrative; and in an Appendix a Report of the Trials of four white persons, on an indictment for attempting to excite the slaves to insurrection. Prepared and published at the request of the Court. By Lionel H. Kennedy and Thomas Parker, members of the Charleston Bar, and the Presiding Magistrates of the Court. Charleston.—J. R. Schenck. 1822.—pp. 188, 8vo.

Fifth Annual Report of the controllers of the Public Schools of the First School District of the State of Pennsylvania: Philadelphia. W. Fry. 1823.

A Refutation of the Calumnies circulated against the Southern and Western States; respecting the institution and existence of slavery among them. To which is added a minute and particular account of the actual state and condition of their negro population; together with historical notices of all the insurrections that have taken place since the settlement of the country.—By a South Carolinian. Charleston. A. E. Miller. 1822. pp. 86, 8vo.

A Summer month, or Recollections of a Visit to the Falls of Niagara and the Lakes.—Philadelphia.—H. C. Carey and J. Lea. 1823. 12mo. pp. 248.

An account of the Yellow Fever, as it prevailed in the city of New-York, in the summer and autumn of 1822. By Peter S. Townsend, M. D. 8vo. pp. 400. Boston, 1823.

Observations upon the FLORIDAS. By CHARLES VIGNOLES, Civil and Topographical Engineer. 8vo. Bliss and White, New-York.—1823.

Religious Intelligence.

The Sixth Anniversary of the New-York Society for the Prevention of Pauperism was held on the 7th of February. Several gentlemen addressed the meeting. We present our readers with an extract from the interesting remarks offered by Theodore Sedgwick, Esq., of Albany:—

‘After a modest introduction, in which,’ says the Christian Herald, ‘he asked for indulgence to the remarks of a stranger, in freely presenting the impressions of his own mind, as they had occurred—he proceeded by commending the ability of the report—with all the views of which, however, he could not concur. After some remarks on the happy institutions of the country, he referred to the objections which some persons cherished against the designs of this society as visionary. Sir, said Mr. S., we did not think thus when the first guns were fired at Lexington. With some, indeed, it was then a vision that we should ever accomplish our independence—it was a vision that we should ever be able to unite under a wise, free, and happy government: it was a vision, too, that under such a government this nation should have attained a population, wealth, power and reputation, such as it at this day enjoys—that was a vision: and many wise persons predicted that it would fail—but, sir, those visions are now realities. Mr. Sedgwick then went on to comment on the measures proposed by the report—In speaking of the *Stepping Mill*, he said, that no doubt similar hopes had been entertained at the introduction of every new punishment in society—and we had had punishments of almost every description. We had had cropping, and whipping, and branding; and even females had been dragged through the streets of this city at the cart tail.—We had lately heard of several pirates, whose bodies had been boiled in oil. This was very shocking—but had we any fewer pirates? These things were not to be presented as any effectual remedy of pauperism. For himself, he was of opinion, that the only efficient remedy was to destroy the whole system of provision for the support of paupers—and in support of his opinion referred to the 5th report of this society, and to the opinions of the

late mayor—on whose character he pronounced a deserved eulogium: Our present magistrate had informed us that he had found, in visiting the Alms House, sixteen hundred persons, all of whom he verily believed were proper objects of the charity of the institution. He did not doubt this was true—and the effectual way to make poor people was to provide for poor people. Look at the country from which we have derived so many of our institutions. Our ancestors began this system in the forty third year of Elizabeth—they began with the very measures we are now pursuing—they put out the children of the poor—and they supplied the parents with work—and what has been the consequence? in fifteen years the poor of England have multiplied tenfold—and here, in this new country, they have doubled in ten years—Look at the example set before our eyes on the other side of the Atlantic. In England there is a public support for the poor—in Scotland there is none—in England paupers are swarming—in Scotland they are scarcely to be found.

He said that it was not impossible to break up this system—if done gradually, its total abolition might be without difficulty accomplished. Look at us, sir, in the country—with us there is not one pauper to one hundred inhabitants—in some neighbourhoods, not one to two hundred—while here, I understand, you are supporting from ten to twelve thousand people. Sir, it is monstrous! You come up to your legislature for laws—and we can send them to you in bundles—but they will do no good—continue your system, and they will go on increasing. Instead of looking for laws and taxes, inquire how do paupers come? In the first place, your city is open to all comers—that, it is true you cannot help—but when the poor of other states, or other countries have flowed into it, instead of warning them that they cannot stay, that they must find some means of support or starve, you welcome and provide for them—no, sir, send them to us in the country—we have room enough for them—we will give them six and eight shillings a day in the summer time—do this, and make no provision to maintain

them, and you will eventually prevent pauperism entirely. The gentleman illustrated his doctrine by the example of a young man, a cartman for instance, who set out well, and falling into bad company gradually abandoned and ruined himself—at his death his property is divided, and his wife and children go to the Alms House. Sir, asked Mr. S., had this young man, when he started, had full warning that unless he supported the wife of his bosom, and the children of his own body, that wife and those children must starve—that if he did not provide, no provision would be made—can you believe he would so easily have yielded and fallen? no, sir,—he lulled his conscience with the secret thought that if he did not provide for them, the public would—a great palace of charity would open its doors, and give them as good, perhaps a better, maintenance than he could earn.

CORNWALL SCHOOL.

From the Religious Intelligencer.

MR. WHITING,—The following letter, just received by me, will probably be gratifying to your readers, and will evince the importance of aiding this Institution, to which is confided the education of youths, from so many different countries, who are destined, we hope, to become the instruments of diffusing the pure light of the Gospel, abroad in the earth. If you think proper, you will give it a place in your valuable paper.

Yours sincerely,

HERMAN DAGGETT.

Cornwall, March 1, 1823.

P. S. The lads, mentioned in the letter of Mr. Fisk, are expected at Cornwall, in a short time.

Extract of a letter from the Rev. Pliny Fisk, Missionary to Western Asia, to the Principal of the Foreign Mission School, Cornwall, (Conn.) dated Malta, Nov. 20, 1822.

DEAR SIR,—I send this letter by the Brig America, and by the same vessel, we send two Greek boys, for the Cornwall School. The vessel put to sea some time ago; but came back severely injured by a storm. The boys were both very sea sick. I entertained serious fears, when the vessel returned, that the boys would not have courage to set out again. They have not, howev-

er, manifested any disposition to remain.

I have given them a few lessons in English and am pleased with their progress. The eldest is Photius Ravasales, about 15 years old. His family, except one brother, perished of the plague at Smyrna, in 1814. This circumstance makes me feel a peculiar tenderness for him, and an interest in his welfare.—The other is Anastasius Raravalles, 11 years old, son of the Greek Priest of Malta. I think they are both promising lads.

It is very desirable, that they should not loose what they now know of Greek. Perhaps it would be well, therefore, to make them study more or less of Greek immediately, and to have them pronounce it as the Greeks pronounce. They have some knowledge also of Italian, and Maltese. The latter is not of so much importance; but the former it is very desirable that they should retain.

I am sensible, dear Sir, that by sending these lads to your care, we are increasing your labours; but the object in view seems to us very important, and I hope the result will be such as to give joy to all who have been concerned in the work. It is very desirable that youths, from the different classes of men who inhabit Western Asia, should be thoroughly and religiously educated, and then return to their own country. We begin with Greeks. Should Providence prosper us, Catholics, Armenians, Copts, Maronites, and perhaps Jews, may follow.

Let us pray fervently for divine direction, and a divine blessing. The view I am now led to take of our mission, and of the countries around us, gives me a high sense of the importance of your office, and of the Cornwall School. May God abundantly bless you, and the youths under your care.

At the last meeting of the Sheffield Public Society, (Eng.) the following interesting facts were mentioned. Gibbon, who in his celebrated history of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, has left an imperishable memorial of his enmity to the Gospel, resided many years in Switzerland, where, with the profits of his works, he purchased a considerable estate. This property has descended to a gentleman, who, out of its rents, expends a large

sum annually in the promulgation of that very Gospel which his predecessor insidiously endeavoured to undermine, not having had courage openly to assail it. Voltaire boasted that with one hand he would overthrow that edifice of Christianity which required the hands of twelve apostles to build up. At this day, the press which he employed at Ferney to print his blasphemies, is actually employed at Geneva in printing the Holy Scriptures. Thus the self same engine, which he set to work to destroy the credit of the Bible, is engaged in disseminating its truths. It is a remarkable circumstance, also, that the first provisional meeting for the re-formation of an Auxiliary Bible Society at Edinburgh was held in the very room in which Hume died. —*Bell's Weekly Messenger.*

DONATIONS TO RELIGIOUS AND CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS.

The Treasurer of the Missionary Society of the Synod of South-Carolina and Georgia acknowledges the receipt of \$2,100 during the year 1822.

The Treasurer of the United Foreign Missionary Society acknowledges the receipt of \$636, 31 during the month of February.

The Treasurer of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions acknowledges the receipt of

\$4,364, 60 from Jan. 13th to Feb. 12th inclusive, besides a legacy of \$500 of the late Hon. Elias Boudinot, LL. D. for the Foreign Mission School; and also \$500 as part of the legacy of the late Dr. Solomon Everest of Canton in this State, \$1,650 having been previously acknowledged.

The Treasurer of the American Bible Society acknowledges the receipt of \$2,530, 08 during the month of February.

REVIVALS OF RELIGION.

The following has been given as a correct statement of the accessions to several churches in New-Jersey, within the last half year:—

Raritan church, Somerville, -	206
Rev. Mr. Boggs, church, Roundbrook, - - - - -	100
Rev. Mr. Brownlee's Basking Ridge, - - - - -	100
Rev. Mr. Vandervoort's, Dutch Valley, - - - - -	42
Rev. Mr. Galpin's Lamington, -	40
Rev. Mr. Schultz's, White House and Lebanon, - - - -	20
Rev. Mr. Studdiford's, Reddington, - - - - -	18
Rev. Mr. Zabriskie's, Millstone, -	20
Rev. Mr. M'Dowell's Morristown,	120
The church of Chatham, - -	77
Rev. F. G. Ballentin's, Deerfield,	41
	<hr/> 784

Ordinations and Installations.

Jan. 1.—The Rev. MARCUS SMITH, was ordained Pastor over the Church and Society in Rensselaerville, N. Y. Sermon by the Rev. Mr. Harrowar.

Jan. 3.—The Rev. PETER S. WYNKOOP was installed Pastor over the Dutch Reformed Church in Ghent, N. Y. Sermon by the Rev. Mr. Johnston.

Jan. 8.—The Rev. Mr. BOYD was ordained Pastor over the Presbyterian Church in Smithfield, N. Y. Sermon by the Rev. John Keep of Homer.

Jan. 22.—The Rev. VALENTINE LOVELL was ordained Pastor over the Congregational Churches in Lovell and Sweden, Me. Sermon by the Rev. Josiah G. Merrill of Otisfield.

Feb. 19.—The Rev. SYLVESTER DANA was installed Pastor over the West Church and Society in Orford, N. H. Sermon by the Rev. Mr. Cook of Acworth.

Feb. 27.—The Rev. FRANCIS WOOD

was ordained pastor over the Congregational Church and Society in Barrington, R. I. Sermon by the Rev. Mr. Williams of Providence.

March 4.—The Rev. SAMUEL READ HALL was ordained Pastor of the Church and Society in Concord, Vt. Sermon by the Rev. Walter Chapin of Woodstock.

March 5.—The Rev. BAXTER DICKINSON was ordained Pastor over the Congregational Church and Society in Longmeadow, Mass. Sermon by the Rev. Nathan Perkins of Amherst.

March 5.—The Rev. JOHN A. HEMSTED was ordained to the work of the ministry in Washington, Mass. Sermon by the Rev. Dr. Perkins of Hartford, Conn.

March 5.—The Rev. SAMUEL W. WHELPLEY was installed Pastor over the First Presbyterian Church in Plattsburgh, N. Y.

View of Public Affairs.

SPAIN, FRANCE AND HER ALLIES.

Our readers, we have no doubt, are generally informed of the intelligence received by the late arrivals from Europe. The next arrival will most probably announce the commencement of war against Spain. The origin of this war can be related in few words.

It will be recollected that the Spanish nation, after one of the most arduous and patriotic struggles of which history furnishes any example, finally succeeded in their resistance to the tyranny of Buonaparte, drove the usurper from the throne, and restored the crown to the family of their lawful sovereign. The blood of the nation was freely poured out in torrents, to accomplish this object; and even the power of Napoleon himself was insufficient to establish a new dynasty in Spain. Joseph Buonaparte was compelled to abdicate the throne. Never was a more devoted loyalty exhibited in the annals of history, than that of the Spanish people to their own monarch. By the patriotic exertions of his people Ferdinand was restored to the throne of his ancestors.

From the progress of science and civilization, and successive improvements in the system of social order, the Spanish people in 1820 had become extensively dissatisfied with the existing government: particularly with the clergy, the inquisition and other abuses of religion; and the *absolute authority* of the monarch. They desired a *limited*, not an absolute monarchy. They were tired of the abuses, which, for a long succession of years, had been practised on them, under pretence of religion, by a corrupt slavish and hypocritical priesthood. The inquisition in Spain, like the Bastille in France, had poured forth the groans of its victims, till the spirit of the age would no longer endure the abuse. From these and other causes originated the revolution of 1820; and though the first insurrectionary movements appeared among the military at the Isle d'Leon, yet subsequent events throughout Spain, shewed that the military were merely the organs of the public will. The constitution of 1812 was reestablished, and Ferdinand voluntarily swore to maintain it. Since this time the devotion of Spaniards to their coun-

try and constitution, have raised them in the estimation of the world; and we had hoped that a people possessing the finest climate and most genial soil, might again enjoy peace, happiness, and national prosperity.

The allied sovereigns however have resolved to change the Spanish constitution by force and to restore the ancient regime: and to add insult to injury, this is undertaken under a pretence of restoring happiness and security to Spaniards themselves.

Such is the cause and origin of the war now about to be waged against the Spanish people,—a war against a sovereign and independent nation for adopting a constitution and form of government, which they supposed best adapted to secure the civil and religious rights of the people, promote their happiness, and extend the blessings of social order.

The King of France at the opening of his parliament declares, that 'one hundred thousand men, with the Duke d'Angouleme at their head, are about to march to preserve the throne of Spain to a descendant of Henry IV. to preserve that free country from ruin and reconcile it with Europe: but let Ferdinand VII. be free to *give a constitution to his people, which they can obtain only from him*, and hostilities shall cease from that moment.'

So then, the only legitimate mode of obtaining any alteration of an existing constitution or form of government is by GRANT from the King! 'Let Ferdinand be free to give a constitution to his people WHICH THEY CAN OBTAIN ONLY FROM HIM!!' This is legitimacy with a witness; this is the creed of the potentates of Europe, formally promulgated by the King of France, and one hundred thousand men, with the Duke d'Angouleme at their head, are probably at this moment enforcing the doctrine at the point of the bayonet; and lest the lessons of this army should fail to produce conviction, the Emperors of Austria and Russia and the King of Prussia are ready to lend their aid at a moment's warning.

'What will be the result of this mighty array of despotic power against the spirit of freedom in the peninsula, time alone can divulge. The crisis is evidently at hand when the great ques-

tion is to be settled, whether forms of government emanating from the will of the people shall be permitted to stand, and liberty acquire a permanent foothold in Europe,' or not.

SCOTLAND.

The Caledonian Canal.—This canal was commenced in A. D. 1802, and has lately been completed, at the expense of \$4,000,000. It runs quite across Scotland, from Murray Firth to Mull Sound, passing through the much celebrated valley in the Highlands known by the name of the Great Glen of Scotland, and thus connects the North Sea with the Atlantic Ocean. Its length is sixty miles; thirty-seven of which are through lakes, and twenty-three are cut canal. The lakes through which it passes are Loch Doufour, Loch Ness, Loch Oich and Loch Lochy. The New Edinburgh Encyclopedia gives the following, as the dimensions of this canal. It is 'one hundred and twenty feet wide at the water's surface, fifty feet wide at the bottom, and twenty feet in depth of water; the

locks are of one hundred and seventy, and one hundred and eighty feet in length, and forty feet in width. These dimensions are sufficient, both in single and united locks, to admit the largest vessels trading between Liverpool and the Baltic, the average of West-Indiamen, and a thirty-two gun frigate when fully equipped.'

By means of this passage many vessels will be saved from the shipwrecks to which they are peculiarly liable, for a great part of the year, in going around by the Shetland and Orkney Isles.

In its width and depth, this canal is at present the largest in the world. The one now constructing in Holland and opening a communication between the island of Texel and the city of Amsterdam, will however, when completed, rather surpass it. That, is to be sixty feet wide at the bottom, and twenty-five feet deep; while, as has already been stated, the Caledonian canal is only fifty feet wide at the bottom and twenty feet deep.

Answers to Correspondents.

H. R.; and A. E*****; shall be inserted.

J. P. W.; D. C.; A—; O. ERATOI; and PARENS are received.

JUVENIS will find the object of his letter, to a considerable extent, answered, by turning to the Appendix to the YOUNG PREACHER'S MANUAL, published some time since at Andover, Mass. The Catalogue of Books there given, with the addition of a few foreign authors, whose value has recently become known to New-England divines, would constitute the foundation of a choice clerical library.

We would remind our correspondents that *all Letters and Communications* sent by mail, *must be post paid*. In repeated instances, we have been obliged to advance more than a dollar postage on a single communication—not unfrequently too, on communications that have been deemed unworthy of insertion. At this rate, it will be perceived that the tax upon us in the course of a year is enormous; whilst, if divided among a great number, it would be to each a mere trifle. Unless the evil is remedied, we shall be obliged to come to a determination not to take letters or communications from the post-office, in any case where this condition is not complied with.

It is from the same cause that we must decline the offers of exchanging with newspapers, which are constantly made to us. It will be recollected that the law which exempts them from postage, does not extend to us.

In order to give the Review of Views of Calvinism entire, that our readers may have the whole subject before them at once, we have curtailed the Department of Religious Intelligence, and also added an *extra* half-sheet to this Number.